

MARCH, 1915

Ten Cents

New Review

A CRITICAL SURVEY OF INTERNATIONAL SOCIALISM

THE RE-BIRTH OF SOCIALISM

A Critical Discussion of the Present and
Future of the Revolutionary Movement
in the Light of the War.

Other Articles:

THE REPRESSED SOUTH—By Joseph C. Manning

CHINA BEFORE AND AFTER THE WAR—By J. A. Jackson

LABOR CASTES AND THE UNSKILLED—By Bruce Rogers

FREE SPEECH AND THE WAR—By Theodore Schroeder

Why The Capitalist?

Every Socialist ought to be able to give answer in a flash, **"No Good Reason Whatever!"** so that even the dumbest mind will grasp and hang to it throughout life. But how many can? Few, indeed!

To make that answer stick, the "rights" of capital, so learnedly put forth, daily, must be met and successfully denied, reason's torch must be applied to the hindering heap of intellectual rubbish that constitutes the battlement of capitalism.

Until the rubbish is dislodged, our message cannot enter and possess the minds of those whom we address. It can at best only reach the emotions; and these, without support of the intellect, soon grow faint and seek other and varying diversions.

We must therefore have head-hunters. These head-hunters must have a firm grip on the working principles of what is called public, or social, or political economy. It is well nigh impossible for any one to get this from the old writers, and make a livelihood besides; the capitalistic writers are false, and therefore confusing and misleading; Marx's Capital is much too difficult, and his explainers do not explain.

The Socialist movement has produced in Frederick Haller a mind especially equipped for head hunting and for training head hunters. His book, **"Why The Capitalist?"** is the last word on that great question. It beats the panders of the capitalistic class to their knees, it sends a consuming flame through their tomes of false teaching, and is withal so clear that a child can read every page with joy and understanding. Many testimonials in our files attest these qualities.

Why The Capitalist? is a \$1.50 book, but we have a lot on hand neatly bound in red cloth that we are letting go for One dollar net.

Any one disappointed in the book may return it within a week and get his money back.

THE GENTILE BOOK CONCERN

1016 Mutual Life Building
BUFFALO, N. Y.

New Review

Vol. III.

MARCH 1915

No. 3

WHERE AND WHITHER?

BY ROBERT RIVES LAMONTE

Where do we stand? Whither are we striving? What must our next step be?

How many of us are ready with clear, definite answers to these simple, yet searching questions?

I have always been inclined to agree with Turgenev in his preference for Don Quixote, the man of action, over Hamlet, the hesitating questioner, but in each of us there is both a Hamlet and a Don Quixote, and there are times like the present when the Hamlet must question and reason before the action of the Don Quixote can become effective.

In a recent issue of the *International Socialist Review* my friend Leffingwell asked us most eloquently: "Are you ready?" He was apparently appealing to the Don Quixote in us to be willing to act. It appears to me that the Don Quixote in us is willing and ready enough to act, but I am not so sure the Hamlet in us is ready and willing enough to *think*, and unless our Hamlet thinks and thinks laboriously and deeply, the action of our Don Quixote is unlikely to be at best anything more effective than battering at illusive and unreal wind-mills.

If our Socialist Hamlets are doing any real thinking we have a right to expect to find its results in the pages of the NEW REVIEW. Do its pages satisfy us?

I quite agree with Professor Ellen Hayes that it is the best magazine we have, but I feel and feel strongly we ought to make it better. Too many of the articles seem to me only to scratch the surface. I do not wish to be ungraciously critical, but to make my meaning clear I must be more specific.

In the February issue so great a thinker as Anton Pannekoek wastes many words on an idle discussion as to whether or no the present war from the German viewpoint is technically a defensive

or an offensive war. Could any question be less important? We who have blushed with shame when our German comrades voted for the War Budget, did so not because we thought Germany was entering on an offensive war (though most of us did think so), but because we felt a German victory would set the clock of human progress backwards, and it grieved us to see our comrades the willing tools of re-action.

Another instance. Most of the remaining articles in the February issue are more or less inspired by an anti-nationalism or anti-patriotism with difficulty to be differentiated from that of the Hervé of 1910. Is not this again a mere, I had almost said, lazy titillation of the surface of things? Is there any serious inquiry into the genesis of the sense of nationalism, the emotion of patriotism? Does any one ask whether love of Germany might not have inspired a Socialist member of the Reichstag to vote against the budget and thus against the degradation of his beloved Fatherland? Has it occurred to any of our Hamlets to ask whether it be not possible that Liebknecht loves Germany as warmly as does Haase?

I feel sure our NEW REVIEW Hamlets can do better than this, and the purpose of this article is to incite them to do so. I, for one, am not ready with answers to the questions with which I began this article. Together, I am hopeful that we can answer them, if not fully and satisfactorily, at least fully enough to furnish us with what scientists call a working hypothesis to guide us in our practical conduct.

Socialism, International Socialism, has broken down. On this we all seem to be agreed. But this was not an isolated occurrence, a sort of bolt from the blue hurled by the gods of 1914. International Socialism failed in 1914 because the various National Socialisms composing it had been growing more and more invertebrate for a decade. This softening of the Socialist spine had been so gradual as to be almost imperceptible, and its occurrence was only revealed to many of us two years ago when, with Bebel's acquiescence and co-operation, the Social Democracy of Germany aided in framing the new taxes for the increase of the German Army.

Then was the banner of idealism lowered and folded away that it might not interfere with the "practical politics" of "Constructive Socialism." The action of the Social Democrats in the Reichstag in August, 1914, was the logical result.

But we are still only tickling the epidermis clothing reality. Why did the German Socialist spine soften? Why do most Socialist spines soften after a few years active service in the movement?

My answer can be no more than tentative, but I give it, for right or wrong, it may provoke a discussion that will bring us nearer to the true answer.

In a word, my answer is, We revolutionists have persistently (inevitably so far, I fear) been putting our New Wine into Old Bottles, a proceeding declared foolish by one of the greatest of revolutionists.

A young man or woman comes into the movement filled and overflowing with revolutionary fervor, eager to change all things, and convinced that when once the assault on the economic foundation is carried the whole institutional superstructure will fall. He sets to work and to do so joins our political machine, and reads and distributes our propagandist literature. What does this mean? Simply that he or she, the fiery apostle of the New, is using the machinery and thought-forms of the Old. Soon he or she becomes subdued by the material with which he works. The revolutionary fervor cools; the iconoclastic neophyte becomes a practical politician of Constructive Socialism; in other words, his or her spine softens.

Is all this too vague? To be more specific, the neophyte as he gets into the party harness grows increasingly to rest the case for Socialism on the individualistic Natural Rights philosophy begotten by petty handicraft, a philosophy that is as yet almost unmodified by the machine industry of our day. Thus his New Wine is poured into the sterilizing bottles of outworn thought-forms.

Still worse, in the actual fight he attempts (*at first*) to use the parliamentary machinery of bourgeois politics for revolutionary purposes. The heady wine of revolution can but turn sour in parliamentary bottles.

I am not blaming or even criticizing any one. I am simply trying to account for the present state of revolutionary effort and organizations all over the world. In fact, what I see on all hands, so far from being blameworthy appears to me so natural as to be almost inevitable. The habits of thought, what we call for want of a better term the institutionalism begotten by any economic era, by any given state of the productive arts always lives far longer than its economic parent. Petty handicraft was moribund in England in the seventeenth century, it was all but dead and buried at the dawn of the nineteenth; and here we are in the second decade of the twentieth still defending or attacking capitalism with weapons forged on the intellectual anvil of petty handicraft. Shall we be blamed for the obsolete weapons we use? We must use some weapons. What else is at hand? Even the astute Veblen confesses he can see no sign that the impact of the Machine Process

is crumbling the walls of the Natural Rights philosophy unless it be the emergence of the Syndicalist movement, and he does not appear sure that this is a true exception.

The twentieth century capitalist rests serene on his "Natural Right" to manage his own property and business as he pleases. The twentieth century trades unionist claims unfalteringly his "Natural Right" to a living wage, and insists on what seems to him his indisputable "Natural Right" to withhold his labor, in other words, to strike at his own sweet will. The twentieth century Socialist continues to assert in all naivety his "Natural Right" to the full product of his labor. All alike, no one more than the others, rest their cases on individualistic interpretations of the natural rights philosophy of the eighteenth century.

I am quite aware that Socialist scholars know that there are some appendices to Marx's *La Misère de la Philosophie*, that show that Marx and Engels did not rest the Socialist case on this stereotyped demand for the full product of one's labor, but I also know that that demand sums up, for ninety-nine Socialists out of a hundred, the whole Creed and Gospel of Socialism.

With the vast mass of present-day technological knowledge and the huge scale of contemporaneous industrial plants, any one given product is so obviously a social product, the outcome of the thought and toil of living thousands and dead millions, that the shibboleth "To each the product of *his* labor," is, when we think, patently an anachronism. For the revolutionist to bawl it, is but to give an added lease of life to a moribund institutionalism.

Yet this is what we all, in greater or lesser degree, consciously or unconsciously have been doing. What is the remedy? We must strive to bring our ideas, our thought-processes up-to-date.

Our doctrine of the inevitability of Socialism (a doctrine I have oft promulgated with pen and voice) is simply disguised Calvinistic pre- or fore-ordination. To the old-time theologian all events were but the outworking into phenomena of the Will of God. To the pantheist and the agnostic the doctrine took the form of Tennyson's "through the ages one increasing purpose runs." We Socialists, emancipated though we thought ourselves, carried over into the doctrine of the inevitability of Socialism all the untenable theological pre-suppositions of Presbyterian fore-ordination. To us Socialism was the one goal toward which all social and sub-social evolution had worked and was working. There was an all-embracing *plan*, and we saw in every event a part of this plan, a factor making for and intending to make for Socialism.

Just as every motion of the mediæval craftsman helped form the object he was making, so we thought the Power behind Social

Evolution made each historical event help to bring Socialism to pass.

Now the machine process has existed long enough, so that we should be able by an effort of the will to avoid for the most part reading into contemporaneous history teleological meanings.

Socialism probably is inevitable, in the sense that somewhere, some time, a revolt of the machine attendants will result in a social organization more or less like what we have been wont to call Industrial Democracy or the Co-operative Commonwealth.

But there is no certitude that the present machine industry of Western Europe and America will give birth to Industrial Democracy.

Handicraft had again and again reached the same stage of development that it had reached in Eighteenth Century England without giving birth to the capitalistic machine industry. That it did so in England in the latter part of the eighteenth and early part of the nineteenth centuries was due to exceptional freedom from retarding and aborting influences.

Only by a more or less fortuitous favorable concatenation of circumstances will our machine age be able to deliver itself of the babe, Socialism.

This is why it is so important we should make no mistakes. This is why our Hamlets should go into the shop and the marketplace and observe, and then withdraw to their studies and ponder.

I wish I could give forth a more positive note. I cannot. My message is largely negative. It seems to me proven that the conventional line of Socialist political activity does not tend to develop and strengthen a revolutionary habit of thought. Further, whatever may be the ultimate revolutionary effects upon our minds and hearts of the machine process, it is clear it does not tend markedly now to produce political Socialists. Otherwise, why does political Socialism grow so much faster in Oklahoma than in Connecticut?

It appears very sure to me that politics (meaning the pursuit of votes and so-called "practical" results) has a most deleterious effect on the characters of its practitioners.

Walling has shown very convincingly that most if not all of the reforms commonly sought by Socialist politicians are likely to be enacted by non-Socialist legislators. And it cannot be denied that some of these reforms would better the condition of the workers.

Under these circumstances can we justify the existence of Socialist Parties? I do not know. I think their continued existence can only be justified by their radical transformation.

If the Socialist Parties resist such a transformation could not

a sincere revolutionary do more useful work in one of the other parties? I do not know.

These are some of the questions for our Hamlets to meditate over.

I can see some signs of the psychological effects of the machine industry in many recent labor conflicts. The workers at times place more stress on their control of the *labor-process*, the conditions of labor, than they do on the precise portion of the product they shall receive.

But it will not do to jump to the conclusion that in Syndicalism we have a cure-all. It appears to be in advance of conventional political Socialism and of old trade-unionism in its mental modes, but it by no means offers us a new set of tactics and pre-suppositions begotten by modern industry. For these we are still waiting.

But we should do more than wait. We should be studying and thinking to see wherein we have failed.

I will hazard one more guess. I will not say we have paid too much attention to economics, but I will say we have paid too little attention to psychology. We have shown by economics what the interest of the workers ought to impel them to do, and what was technically possible for them to do, but we have spent very little time in seeking earnestly to discover what under the circumstances of their drab lives they were likely to do.

This, I suspect, is the source of multitudinous failures.

The imperative desideratum just now is serious study by Socialists of psychology. In the past we have contented ourselves with vague assertions that thoughts, emotions, etc., were all determined by the economic foundation of society. *How* they are so determined we have neither asked nor told.

One of the most hopeful signs of the times is that really good, conscientious work is being done along these lines, but as yet little of it is the work of professed Socialists. The best work of this sort I have seen is in Graham Wallas' "The Great Society," and Veblen's "The Instinct of Workmanship." The latter has been reviewed in the NEW REVIEW by Max Eastman. Eastman calls it an optimistic book. So, in a sense, it is. For it insists on the deep-rooted permanent character of those tendencies that fit man for a peaceful life largely free from excessively egoistic desires.

But, in another sense, it is a pessimistic book, for it shows that a race endowed with these characteristics is extremely ill-fitted to live under the present conditions of our machine age and it also points out that the machine process has not as yet undermined the natural rights philosophy which has thus far been the great institutional buttress of private property in the machinery of production.

It cannot be doubted that the upper-savage traits which he thinks are still the essential traits of humanity in Western Europe and America, would find a far more congenial *milieu* in Industrial Democracy than in the present orgy of self-interest. But the doubt he suggests to my mind is: Will the machine process bring forth a new mental habit in its victims that will fit and impel them to rebel and inaugurate a new system of control of machinery? I do not say of *ownership* of machinery, for I think Veblen makes it clear the concept of ownership is alien to the upper-savage mind.

Here is our great work, it would seem to me. We must study the psychology of the workers who are most continuously subject to the impact and routine of the machine process, and wherever we note the emergence of a new mental habit, a novel point of view, an unconventional thought-process, we must seize upon it, foster it, develop it, until in good time we can furnish Socialist neophytes New bottles into which to pour their New Wine.

When we can do that we shall be near the dawn of the new era.

CHINA BEFORE AND AFTER THE WAR

BY J. A. JACKSON

For many years previous to the revolution of 1911 the Chinese had been gradually realizing the weakness of their country and the great wealth and power of foreign nations. The Russo-Japanese war caused them to see that this power could be obtained and used by Asiatics as well, and from that time grew up desire for change on Western lines. The great bulk of the people probably did not share these new ideals and desires but remained stubbornly conservative and content with their ancient customs, manners, traditions and literature; but still there was during the last decade a large educated class which had grasped the fact that some radical change was necessary. It was clearly seen by this educated class that there was one obstacle in the way of a radical change and that was the inert conservative mass of the Manchu court. The Emperor was hidden away in the Forbidden City at Peking surrounded by eunuchs who held great power. It was impossible for any official to approach the Emperor without having first given a liberal squeeze or present to the eunuchs. The whole official life was corrupt and promotion was not by merit. The Manchus did very little to remedy this and it was this hopeless state of affairs which, more than anything else, fed the fires of revolution among the student and intellectual class.

These sentiments were clearly expressed in Dr. Sun Yat-sen's manifesto to the foreign powers issued from Nanking on the 12th of January, 1912, just after his inauguration as Provisional President. It said: "The hitherto irremediable suppression of the individual qualities and national aspirations of the people having arrested the intellectual, moral and material development of China the aid of revolution has been invoked to extirpate the primary cause, and we now proclaim the overthrow of the despotic sway of the Manchus and the establishment of a republic."

It is just two years since the republic was established, but on reviewing that period one sees that these high ideals have not been realized. The cause is not difficult to discover.

At the time the revolution broke out Yuan Shih-kai was living in retirement at his home in Honan Province, but after a few months of the revolution he was recalled by the Manchus and appointed Premier on the 7th of November, 1911. The next step taken was for the National Assembly to pass nineteen articles or demands which would have given the Chinese people a limited monarchy but left the control of national affairs in the hands of Parliament, the members of which would have the power of selecting the Premier and the Cabinet. These articles were no doubt framed by Yuan and were accepted by the throne, but the revolutionists assembled at Nanking would not accept them. They knew from history what a corrupting influence the Court with its eunuchs had exercised on the national life; they determined to break up completely this centre of national weakness, and demanded a republic.

On the 21st of December, 1911, Premier Yuan Shih-kai publicly announced his refusal to accept a republic. Consequently, on the 1st of January, 1912, Dr. Sun Yat-sen was inaugurated as Provisional President at Nanking by the Assembly there. Simultaneously, Yuan Shih-kai declared that he would fight for a monarchical form of government. But the fates were against the Manchus and the Emperor abdicated. It was then that Yuan Shih-kai climbed down and agreed to accept a republic if he was appointed as president. The bulk of the revolutionists and reformers would not accept him as president, but Dr. Sun Yat-sen thought that it would be safe to trust Yuan in that position, and therefore he resigned and handed over his position as provisional president to Yuan. In order to rid the government and official circles of the corrupting influence of the Court it was desired by many revolutionists that the capital should be at Nanking or Wuchang, but this point, although raised, was also conceded, and Peking remained the capital.

On the 11th of March, 1912, a provisional constitution was adopted and the Advisory Council assembled at Peking with Tang Shao-yi as Premier and Hsiung as Minister of Finance. It was seen that a foreign loan was absolutely necessary. Hsiung Hsi-ling entered into negotiations with a group of foreign financiers representing banks in England, Germany, France, Russia, America and Japan, who had apparently combined together with the object of avoiding competition, and the playing off of one bank against another by the Chinese. Many conferences were held, but these came to no agreement. At the last of these conferences held at Peking on the 19th of June, 1912, this sextuple group of bankers brought forward further demands as follows:—

1. That the group should have complete control of any further loans for a period of five years.
2. That the Salt Gabelle having been offered as security for the loan should be managed by foreigners similar to the Customs.
3. That the government should accept a representative of the group as financial advisor.
4. That a foreigner should be appointed as president of the Audit Bureau.

It will be seen from this that the object of the sextuple group of bankers was to get a firm grip on the finances of the Chinese Government. The Minister of Finance saw this and rejected these terms most emphatically. Then followed the renowned Crisp loan in October, but of the £10,000,000 only part was advanced owing to the strong opposition of the British Government. This action, combined with the fact that none of the foreign powers had recognized the republic, indicated clearly that pressure was being brought to bear to get China to accept the loan on the terms laid down by the sextuple group.

It is not often that one has it so clearly demonstrated how European governments work hand in hand with capitalists, and that, too, of only certain capitalists, who in addition to the liberal interest on the loan, were also looking forward to placing their numerous friends and hangers-on in soft billets. In one way it was to be expected, after seeing the way in which the British Government treated Morgan Shuster in Persia, and then became involved in a Marconi scandal. The very close connection between political diplomacy and financial groups was again clearly illustrated in June, 1913, when the sextuple group advanced £25,000,000 to the Chinese Government in spite of the protests of Parliament at Peking, and also many of the Provincial Tutuhs or Governors. There is no doubt that if that loan had not been advanced the government would have been forced to punish those who were implicated in the foul murder of Sung Chiao-jen.

The loan was unconstitutional and was rushed through suddenly in the dead of night. It evidently had the sanction of the Powers who wished to support the "strong man," *i.e.*, Yuan Shih-kai. In the same way, Great Britain has supported President Huerta, the "strong man" of Mexico, whereas the United States Government in both Mexico and China has taken up the opposite policy of working towards a democratic form of government.

This policy of Great Britain in China has not only been disastrous to foreign trade, but also has prevented a permanent settlement of the country. With the support of the Foreign Powers, President Yuan Shih-kai has carried forward his policy of using force with the following results:—

1. The assassination of Sung Chiao-jen, a prominent member of Parliament, who would probably have been Premier.

2. The obtaining of a loan in an unconstitutional manner against the emphatic protests of Parliament, and Provincial Governors.

3. The dismissal of the Tutuhs or Governors of Anhui, Kiangsi, Kuantung, Kiangsu, and Hunan Provinces because they had joined in the national protest.

4. The Punitive Expedition against Yuan.

The Punitive Expedition against the President was unsuccessful because a part of the money advanced by the sextuple group was used in bribing the officers in the opposing forces.

Since the establishment of the republic, five Cabinets have been formed, under Premiers Tang Shao-yi, Liu Ching-hsiang, Tuan Chi-jui, Chao Ping-chun, and Hsiung Hsi-ling. This is a clear indication that the autocratic despotism of Yuan Shih-kai is unstable and is crumbling away so far as he has failed to get a body of men who will work with him for any length of time. China cannot be strong where there is no unity. Upon his resignation, the Premier Hsiung Hsi-ling expressed his opinion that "the whole of the Cabinet should be appointed and selected by the President." But this is surely what has already been done, as all the Premiers named above were Yuan's own friends and supporters. The effect of this chopping and changing has resulted in nothing permanent being done and has had the effect of placing the power in the hands of the President.

The actions of President Yuan Shih-kai appear to have been directed solely to the strengthening of his own position and the crushing of any independent views. The first Parliament assembled in April, 1913, with a majority for the reform party—the Kuo Min Tang—which was well organized. Shortly after its first meeting, President Yuan Shih-kai formed an opposition party of

his own, called the Chin Pu Tang, which at once commenced a very brisk obstruction in Parliament.

In addition to this, however, the Government of Yuan Shih-kai bribed members of Parliament to support its petty cause (see the Kuo Min Tang manifesto issued June 5th, 1913), and this was well known and has never been denied by the Government. Instead of Yuan Shih-kai working with Parliament he worked against it and never gave it a chance of getting the least bit of work done. This, however, only proves that the constitution under which they were working was impossible, and all this trouble would have been avoided had Yuan Shih-kai accepted the constitution drawn up at Nanking, which was on similar lines to the rules of the House of Commons, leaving all power in Parliament.

When the Punitive Expedition occurred in July, 1913, the meetings of Parliament were suspended, and when the civil warfare was finished the President issued on November 5th an order dissolving the Kuo Min Tang, because its members had taken a prominent part in the expedition, and suspending three hundred members from Parliament. That party had 130 members in the Upper House and 256 in the Lower House, and consequently was wiped out, thus leaving matters entirely in the hands of the Chin Pu Tang (Yuan's own party), but the latter party on the 9th of November decided to stay away from Parliament permanently. From that date to its final dissolution, on January 11th, 1914, no business was done by that body. In fact, owing to the obstruction, Parliament did next to no business during the whole of its short existence of eight months, and this first Chinese Parliament for which the Chinese had been looking forward for many years with hopes, ceased to exist.

President Yuan is thus left sole autocrat with the rump of Cabinet. In order to give his orders a slight tinge of having been approved by his friends, he selected and established a Political Council consisting of seventy-eight members, thoroughly subservient and absolutely useless.

As a preparatory stage to the introduction of a democratic form of government the Manchus had inaugurated a system of elective bodies in every fu (county) in each province which were to serve as a check upon the permanent officials. Previously, Provincial Governors had been allowed a free hand, so long as they kept their provinces quiet, and duly remitted a fixed sum to the Imperial Court at Peking. With the introduction of these democratic bodies, however, some friction naturally arose, owing to the fact that they had no control over taxes or expenditure, and therefore could not fulfill their duties, as the officials could always find some excuse

not to endorse their recommendations. Therefore, following the reactionary methods of President Yuan in abolishing Parliament, the Provincial Tutuhs petitioned that these self-governing bodies (as they are called) should be abolished, and consequently President Yuan, in an order, dissolved these bodies. In dissolving the Peking self-governing body, he stated "such bodies were useless in a republic"! But are they of use under an autocracy?

That President Yuan Shih-kai is pursuing a destructive policy is evident when we remember that he has dissolved the great party—the Kuo Min Tang—along with many smaller societies, such as the Socialist Party, the Labor Party, and even the Suffragette Society. He has dissolved Parliament, the Provincial Assemblies, and in fact all representative bodies. Most of the opposition newspapers have also been closed. The total result of all this is that at the present time Yuan Shih-kai has more power than any Manchu emperor ever had. The Manchu emperors had a Board of Censors who were at liberty to even criticise the Emperor's actions as well as those of any official, but it no longer exists, and now even a newspaper can only criticise in guarded and mild terms. The Manchu emperors were surrounded by eunuchs, but President Yuan has their equivalent in the large army of secretaries who fill his palace. Yuan is isolated inside the Forbidden City, and is as completely out of touch with the actual people as any emperor ever was.

In other words, there is an atmosphere of unreality and make-believe in Chinese Government affairs just now, with nothing solid and substantial in the whole structure. It rests almost entirely upon one man and he has numerous enemies who are pledged to revenge the foul murder of Sung Chiao-jen last year, and should he "take a cup of bad tea" as predicted by Prince Ching, the whole fabric will collapse, when no doubt the foreign financiers will again press their governments that they should be allowed to step in and salve the wreckage. The ideas at the back of the 1911 revolution have not been realized, but the desire is still there and will shortly find expression. The revolutionists cannot make an active move at the present moment, but I am told that there is a strong undercurrent which has widespread support. The Kuo Min Tang, which is supposed to be non-existent, is still active throughout the East, and if the Government continues its present policy there must be another upheaval in the near future.

What, therefore, should be done? It amounts to this, that a great majority of the enlightened classes desire a democratic form of government and are extremely discontented with the present state of affairs. The foreign powers exert a tremendous influence in China because they must be approached for loans. All that is

required is that Great Britain especially should take up a firm stand that in future no further loans will be advanced unless sanctioned by Parliament. This would be the thin end of the wedge which would force the Government to assemble Parliament with full powers to control finance. It would compel the Government to work in harmony with representatives of the people and would show the folly of bribing members of Parliament. China will have to be governed by a party system just as is done in other countries. At present this is done, although Yuan's party is very restricted and is mostly composed of officials who are keen on keeping their jobs, and therefore do not offer any independent advice but agree to all that their master wants. The sooner this rule of oligarchy gives place to Parliamentary control of finance, legislation, and the cabinet, the better it will be for China.

(Concluded in the April Issue)

THE MENACE OF AN AMERICAN MILITARISM

BY LOUIS C. FRAINA

I

All of the belligerent nations disclaim responsibility for the Great War. All of them claim to be on the defensive. Germany is defending its "Kultur"—its civilization, its national achievements; the Allies are defending themselves against Militarism—German Militarism, the defeat of which they say means freeing Europe from militarist domination. They are using the idealism of the people to justify their actions and arouse enthusiasm for the war.

It is easy to sneer at all this. War has been an instrument of progress; but wars are seldom waged because of the impulse to progress—surely not this particular war. But it's absurd to dismiss the idealism of the belligerent nations as mere buncombe and hypocrisy: a large measure of it is that, a still larger measure is a sincere social passion which seeks to assert itself and use the war as an instrument of progress. The social significance of this idealism is a vital fact: *war in itself has lost its charm and justification, governments are compelled to recognize the progressive idealism of the people and use it to justify war and wage war.*

The precipitation of the war was a triumph of militarist barbarism; the justifications of the governments involved are a triumph of popular progressive idealism. And this fact offers a magnificent opportunity in the belligerent nations after the war, in the neutral nations *now*, for this popular idealism to assert itself

in an effort first of all to compel disarmament and then, which is much more important, to secure permanent peace.

Militarism must ally itself with this idealism to maintain its prestige. Our task, the task of all democrats, is to articulate this idealism and use it to smash militarism. But in spite of this magnificent opportunity our progressive idealism is allowing itself, consciously and unconsciously, to become the tool of an American militarism. And the responsibility for this impending calamity rests with the politicians and intellectuals of the Progressive movement and the Socialist party. Instead of a propaganda to warm the idealism of the masses; instead of an enthusiasm which throws dogmas and dickers to the winds; instead of a magnificent disregard for "limitations" and "the impossible"—instead of all this, these pettifogging politicians and impotent intellectuals coldly, stupidly weigh ends and means, party advantage, tactical logic. They are dead to life and its splendid passions, its "impossible" idealisms.

American Progressivism is allying itself with the most reactionary elements in a campaign for militarism. The *New Republic*, intellectual expression of Progressivism, is brilliantly weaving philosophy, sociology and science into arguments for militarism. Theodore Roosevelt is preparing to make militarism a dominant issue in 1916. The danger is acute. Militarism is generally popular with certain sections of the middle-class and aristocracy of labor—as in the France of Louis Napoleon and in Germany to-day.

A pitiable and despicable thing it is that the young and pragmatic idealists of the progressive movement should encourage the growing hysteria of American Militarism. Their actions are a final proof of the moral bankruptcy of Progressivism. It is not astonishing that Roosevelt should clamor for militarism—his Cæsarian traits and brute-virtues are characteristic of the militarist. Walter Lippmann is typical of the progressive idealist pitifully gone astray. In the *Metropolitan* he opens an article on "A Cure for Militarism" with a trenchant indictment of the evils of militarism. A really magnificent indictment. But the conclusion is a complete negation of the indictment:

"The first reaction is to cry, 'Away with it. We must have no more to do with militarism; Europe has armed, and there was a war; let's disarm and there'll be no war; we must have none of what Wells called the "drilling, trampling foolery in the heart of Europe."' But is it possible to do this?

"It is possible if the American people are willing to pay the price. The price is a discarding of the Monroe Doctrine, the willingness to have Europe and Asia establish military power in this hemisphere, the admission of Asiatic immigrants, and an abandon-

ment of almost all our ambition to play a leading part in the organization of the world's peace. We may not be in the slightest danger of invasion, but if in an armed world we disarm, or allow our armament to be enfeebled, we shall count less and less in the councils of the nations."

Lippmann justifies this time-serving conclusion in the way customary with the reactionary: "It is not a pretty doctrine, I know, but the world is not yet a pretty place," and insists that "unterrified, realistic democracy is not blind to the problem of defense." In the same issue of the *Metropolitan*, Morris Hillquit indulges in the identical language and illusion: the lofty ideal of Socialism "does not blind the Socialists to the implacable realities of present-day conditions." Hillquit refuses to say that Socialism is against armaments and militarism.

The Milwaukee *Leader*, of which Victor L. Berger is editor, holds the same point of view: Socialism is not pacifist, not against armament: "We must meet conditions as they are" "in an age of capitalistic competition for the world's markets." The jingoism of the *Leader* is as bad as that of Lippmann and bourgeois militarists:

"It is possible that if American industry should be scrapped, American forts could be dispensed with, American battleships scuttled, and American soldiers disarmed without inviting invasion or disaster. But until the American workingman shall be prepared to take the little brown brother to his bosom and until the American capitalist shall manifest a disposition to surrender his advantages, until the Monroe Doctrine shall be repudiated and American pretensions to the overlordship of two continents abandoned a reasonable amount of common sense would suggest that, at least, we should take such a reasonable and democratic measure for national defense as is found in a citizen soldiery."

In this, as in certain other matters of policy, Berger and Hillquit are in full agreement with the reactionary elements of Bourgeois progressivism.

II.

The Socialist Party is now discussing a proposed peace programme. It is an utterly incompetent programme. While many locals of the party are adopting resolutions emphatically opposing all forms of war and militarism, the party officials suggest a programme not only reactionary but insidiously pro-militarist. Instead of demanding disarmament, it weakly urges "limitation of armament"; proposes an international police force—which would be a power for crushing "backward races" and proletarian revolts. It indulges in a lot of twaddle concerning "tribunals" and "arbitration." Its programme is "practical"—calls for "federation of all peace forces," and then makes this federation impossible by pro-

posing industrial democracy and Socialism as necessary immediate factors for permanent peace. It proposes the superficial political measures of bourgeois pacifism, and does not stress the fundamental remedy—economic internationalism.

And while this programme was being framed and is being discussed, the menace of an American militarism is growing stronger—and the Socialist Party programme completely ignores this menace! Instead of concentrating its power in a fight against the menace of militarism and its causes, the Socialist Party indulges in the farce of a propaganda to “Starve the War and Feed America!”

It is a cunning campaign our American Militarists are waging. They are demanding an investigation into “our defenses,” and say they simply desire “adequate preparation.” But what *is* adequate preparation? The answer is being given by those who demand a larger army and navy, some form of general military service. The clamor for investigation and “adequate preparation” is a prelude to worse things. Psychologically, politically, the public is being prepared for an American militarism.

All the European nations, except Belgium and England, were prepared for war—particularly Germany and France. The Great War has proven the fallacy of “adequate preparation” as a means of preserving peace. “Adequate preparation” is its own negation; all nations being equally prepared adequately, obviously neutralizes the preparedness of each. “Adequate preparation,” by developing an illusion of power is, if anything, an incitement to war—a vital factor in Germany’s precipitance of the war. But Roosevelt draws the opposite conclusion:

“The most important lesson for the United States to learn from the present war is the vital need that it shall at once take steps to prepare. Preparedness against war does not always avert war or disaster in war, any more than the existence of a fire department—that is, preparedness against fire—always averts fire. But it is the only assurance against war, and the only insurance against overwhelming disgrace and disaster in war. Preparedness usually averts war and usually prevents disaster in war; and always prevents disgrace in war.”

“Adequate preparation,” according to Roosevelt, “is the only assurance against war”;—but what about the *causes* of war? Bourgeois militarist and bourgeois pacifist both ignore the fundamental causes of war; one says adequate armament is a protection against war, the other says armament itself produces war. Preparations for war are simply an expression of the latent impulse to war; and this impulse is a reflex of trade rivalry and privilege, pro-

tectionism, nationalism, militarism, the hysteria of fear—a synthesis of factors provocative of war, *which must be destroyed*.

Preparation against whom? The United States to-day has no enemy against whom to prepare—even Roosevelt concedes there are no grounds for fear of Japan—*unless our national policy produces an enemy*.

“Let us either put our army and navy upon a common-sense basis,” says the piously Christian *Outlook*, “balanced, organized, and equipped for the task that confronts them, or let us withdraw from the Philippines, turn over the Panama Canal to Siam, and forget that we once had a president by the name of Monroe.”

There is no possibility of having to defend the Panama Canal *unless the United States intends using it as a means of aggression*. Fortifying the Canal was an error, unnecessary; the United States can retain control of the Canal peaceably by making it clear that it will not be used as a means of potential aggression.

Shall the Philippines, which serve no rational purpose of national policy, serve as a pretext for militarizing the United States? The Philippines should be granted independence; even if that is not done, their possession constitutes no menace to our peace unless retained for purposes of aggression.

The Monroe Doctrine is an anachronism. A necessary policy of defense against monarchical Europe and the “Holy Alliance” in the early days of our Republic, the Doctrine is now as impudent as it is useless. None of the European nations have designs on the American Continent; the self-reliant Republics of South America resent the Monroe Doctrine as an insult to their sense of independence, and fear it as a potential agency of *United States* aggression. As things are now, the Doctrine must either be discarded or serve as the tool of an American imperialism and militarism seeking to impose its own “Kultur” upon our neighbors. Europe and Asia establish military power in America? Absurd! Asia has a sufficiently mighty task developing her own resources; and none of the nations of Europe, particularly after the Great War, can contemplate American aggression. The only danger of a conflict with Asia lies not in Asiatic desire to establish military power in America, *but in the plans of certain of our imperialists to conquer “spheres of influence” in Asia*.

The only real factor which might precipitate a war is the anti-immigration policy popular among our aristocracy of labor and certain sections of the middle-class. This policy is a threat to the peace of the world. Here, indeed, is the one potent reason for an American militarism. For if the United States is seriously proposing to keep Asiatics completely out of the American con-

continent, possibly Europeans as well, we will eventually have to fight Europe and Asia in arms against this reactionary policy. Is it wise, is it necessary to invite the evils of militarism and the prospects of universal race-war in order to pander to the prejudices and illusory interests of the aristocracy of labor and middle-class?

There is no valid argument in economics for anti-immigration. Immigration has been one of the great constructive social forces in America. The identical arguments made to-day against the admission of Asiatics and south-eastern Europeans were made against the Germans and Irish half a century ago. Only temporarily, if at all, does the immigrant lower the standard of living—and even that is not due to his being an immigrant; his wages as an unskilled worker are about equal to the wages of the American unskilled worker. The A. F. of L. refuses to organize Asiatics, and then brands them as “unorganizable.” Most of the revolutionary impulses in the labor movement in recent years have been an expression of immigrant workers on strike. Our policy should not be to exclude immigrants, but to assimilate them.

But even if the immediate economic interests of the workers were at stake, the dangers of racial exclusion are too gigantic, too real, too inhuman for us to favor anti-immigration.

Baiting the “Jap” and the “Chink” is a dangerous sport. Japan is making it clear that she has no quarrel with the United States unless we insult her people beyond human endurance.

A rational immigration policy would avert the one real possibility of war and the one real argument for an American militarism. It is the task of the Socialist movement to act accordingly; and *its campaign against militarism necessarily implies a campaign against all conditions provocative of war.*

III

Hillquit claims that “Socialists are not indiscriminate pacifists” because our lofty ideal “does not blind Socialists to the implacable realities of present-day conditions.” Militarism and nationalism are “implacable realities:” Capitalism, industrial oppression, wage-slavery are all “implacable realities:” and if we can combat the latter why not the former? Our task is not to be “practical;” the German Social Democracy was “practical,” and its collapse is a practical demonstration of a dangerous fallacy. Only the “impractical” can justify Socialism: our task is not to accept but to transform “implacable realities,” to articulate an idealism which shall arouse enthusiasm and action. Socialism should express conditions *as they are becoming*, not conditions as they are.

The issue is clear: *Socialism must oppose all forms of war and seek to remove all causes of war—oppose militarism and na-*

tionalism, protectionism and racial exclusion, and demand universal disarmament.

Socialism, runs an argument, has not the power to compel disarmament, hence should not advocate disarmament. *Ergo*: Socialism has not the power to abolish Capitalism, hence should not advocate the overthrow of Capitalism.

Our campaign against militarism and for disarmament can secure the co-operation of non-Socialist sections of the people. The abolition of militarism and war is a democratic issue and concerns humanity, democracy and Socialism alike. Socialism can convert this issue into a revolutionary issue: its potential educational and political value is tremendous.

Conservatives in our movement generally appeal to the past for justification. They prattle of "implacable realities," but are really slaves of the past and its illusions.

Eduard Bernstein argues that Marx was not a pacifist. (Marx was not a reformist, but that doesn't prevent Bernstein being one.) He points out that Marx urged the Germans *after the Franco-Prussian War* had broken out to support Prussia, as the victory of Prussia would mean German unity and the collapse of Bonapartism. It may be remarked, however, that war was not indispensable for that consummation. Economic development would have united Germany without war—the Prussian victory simply achieved that unity a few years sooner, *and was a direct historical cause of the present Great War by making Junker and militarist Prussia supreme in United Germany and humiliating France*. Bonapartism, which desired war to prop up its tottering dynasty, would have crumbled under the weight of its own corruption and incompetence without a Prussian conquest.

Hillquit cites the fact that in 1848 Marx called for "a general war of revolutionary Europe against the stronghold of European reaction—Russia." But should this be an argument against Socialist advocacy of disarmament to-day? Conditions have changed since the stormy days of 1848; observe that Marx called upon "*revolutionary Europe*." There is no such situation to-day. Marx had in mind popular democratic wars,—wars waged by democratic revolutions against feudal tyranny, as the wars of the French Revolution; and wars waged for national unity, as those of Italy and the Balkans. Wars of this character, however, are largely a thing of the past. Hillquit admits that "national and civil wars of independence or emancipation and the 'holy wars' for humanitarian purposes are rare and becoming ever rarer." The Great War, particularly if Socialists and Democrats use the opportunity, should settle once and for all the Balkan and Turkish problems

and the problems of national autonomy, drive Europe to abolish tariff barriers and develop a real economic internationalism; together with the task of economic reconstruction in Europe, that should mean disarmament; and *military preparations in America give the militarists of Europe an argument against disarmament*. After peace is made the one real danger of war will probably be the Far East, *and that danger should cease if Europe and America give up their attempts to dominate the Far East*. To fight against these attempts at domination will be an important task of the new Socialist International.

The silliest argument of militarist Socialists is the claim that some day Socialism may need war to overthrow Capitalism, and a "Citizen Army" would provide the necessary tool. This should really be an argument for disarmament. The more armaments Capitalism has the greater its power against the proletariat and revolution. If the revolutionary proletariat of Paris went down to disaster before the relatively toy artillery of Napoleon, one shudders to contemplate what would happen to the modern proletariat marching against 42-centimetre guns *which under any plan of armament would be in the hands of the master class*. This prattle of armed revolution, usually indulged in by reactionary conservatives, is a survival of the insurrectionary ideology of 1848; the revolutionary proletariat to-day recognizes revolutionary class unionism as the force necessary for the overthrow of Capitalism. *Disarmament means disarming the Capitalist class*; consider what that means should it come to Socialist insurrection!

The ghastly tragedy of some American Socialists advocating a "Citizen Army"! Roosevelt advocates the same thing. Modern war is waged with machines—the modern army itself is a machine. "The 'armed nation' (Citizen Army)," says Wibaut, "now and henceforth means a nation equipped with all the machinery human spirit has invented for the destruction of man." A "Citizen Army" would lessen the burdens of militarism in times of peace and ease the Middle Class burden of taxation, but it would not and could not destroy militarism. Nor is a "Citizen Army" necessarily democratic; being in the control of the ruling class it is a weapon against democracy and the proletariat. In Switzerland the "Citizen Army" is un-democratic; possesses a plutocratic officers' caste; and is used to suppress strikes. Many Swiss Socialists cite these facts as arguments against voting the military appropriations.

Socialists hitherto have accepted the criterion that only a defensive war should be participated in by Socialists. But the complexity of forces precipitating wars to-day makes it appear that all nations are on the defensive—as in Europe. Kautsky years

ago proposed a different criterion: proletarian and democratic interests. But Kautsky now concludes, and rightly, that this criterion is also inadequate: the French and German Socialists applied the democratic and proletarian criterion and arrived at opposite conclusions. Kautsky's new criterion, that all nations being on the defensive justifies all Socialists in supporting their governments, is preposterous and impossible. Clearly, emphatically, Socialism must adopt the criterion: *against all wars because in all wars national interests are the decisive factors*. This criterion implies anti-nationalism and Socialist advocacy of complete disarmament.

Socialists who oppose disarmament are nationalists—they place national interests above class interests. Hillquit, in the *Metropolitan* article previously quoted, again clearly indicates his nationalistic bias:

“What lies at the bottom of the Socialist attachment for the fatherland is not so much the abstract ethical sentiment as the solid material motive. The same, of course, holds true of all other classes of the population. The country is the economic unit of modern society. It supplies the food and sustains the lives of its inhabitants. The ancient and true formula of internationalism *Ubi panis ibi patria* may with equal justice be reversed into *Ubi patria ibi panis*: Where the fatherland is there is the bread.”

This reactionary doctrine supplants Socialist Internationalism as a proletarian tactic with economic nationalism. It is a complete abandonment of the revolutionary Socialist stand-point. When one says the nation provides a living for the workers one means the Capitalist class dominant in that nation; and for the workers to protect national interests means protecting the interests of the Capitalist class. The obvious and menacing implication is that the class struggle must be subordinated to the struggle of nations, if not completely abandoned, particularly if the bourgeois Socialist party controls the nation by means of State Socialism.

This economic nationalism of the Socialist conservatives is more reactionary than that of the Capitalist, because Capitalist nationalism by the very law of motion of its development tends to economic internationalism.

The struggle against militarism and nationalism, accordingly, assumes an intensely revolutionary significance. It means a struggle against the emasculation and practical abandonment of Socialist principles.

Our immediate revolutionary task is to fight the menace of an American militarism, as this menace constitutes a menace to revolutionary Socialist integrity.

THE REPRESSED SOUTH

BY JOSEPH C. MANNING

[Joseph C. Manning was one of the leaders of the Populists, at the time when their movement, the only radical or genuinely democratic movement the South ever witnessed, had very considerable power in that section and did not hesitate to combine with the Republicans and the Negroes. Mr. Manning is chiefly concerned with the repression of the white population, though he would also wipe out every discrimination against the negroes and regards the poor whites and the colored as suffering from identical evils which require identical remedies—more democracy. Socialists will find Mr. Manning's remedy, the enforcement both in letter and in spirit of the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments of the Constitution to be insufficient—though many will agree that this should be one of the first steps to be taken. But the conclusion forms a very small part of Mr. Manning's article, which is a suggestive statement of the recent political history of the South and the present situation in that section.—EDS.]

Prior to the Civil War, insisting upon it as a right, the slaveholding Democratic party held representation in the general government on a basis of representation which included three-fifths of the slave population. Five slaves of the South, voiced for by Southern masters, were pitted in the basis of representation with three white citizens of the free North. Now the continued aggression of the audacious leadership of the present so-called Democratic party of the South has succeeded in going much farther; it not only finally brought about the usurpation of representation for practically *all* the Colored population, but has, through a system of political intrigue and political repression, accomplished the suffrage elimination of *more than half of the white male population of voting age in the far Southern states*. Having obtained domination over the masses of the people of the South, by subverting popular government, this regime is now the controlling factor of the general government; while, with this force and fraud acquired power, Southern leadership is now seeking to plant and to foster their prejudices and ideas on the government at Washington and to imprint their conceptions of human justice upon the public sentiment of the country.

How great this political repression in the Southern states has become is not grasped by the people of this country. Through the adroit representations of those who dominate in the states of the South, the rest of the country has been caused to have the general

opinion that the Democratic party in the South and the white South are one and the same thing. This Democratic party in the Southern states is neither a democracy nor is it the white South. Just as was the slave owning element a minority ruling the South during slavery, constituting, as it did, government of, for and by a class, so is the existing condition one of minority government in the South. The minority element dominating the South to-day is the political progeny of the Democratic party of slavery. The intolerant and arrogant leadership of the slave holding Democratic party is embodied in the spirit of repression which characterizes the leadership of those responsible for present conditions.

The slave-holding political oligarchy was absolutely dominant in the religious, social, industrial and political life of the South. There was no freedom of discussion and no propaganda of thought beyond that of the slave holding leadership. Only one-fifth of the white children attended school. The masses of whites were surrounded with an atmosphere that meant to them a social, industrial, educational and political inertia not conducive to their welfare. The non-slave holding whites were subjected to a leadership which subdued them as mercilessly as did the crack of the whip of the slave driver over-awe the Colored person held in human bondage. The slave holder, the planter aristocrat, had become so distinctive as a class and so impregnated with the feeling of superiority that he looked down, from his exalted station, upon the non-slave owning whites and so much so that even the Colored people in slavery imbibed this spirit from the master and learned to refer to the white masses as "poor white trash." And the presence of the Colored people in the South now, as before the Civil war, is availed of by the dominating regime, not only to suppress free speech, but is employed as a pretext to subvert free government.

The rest of the country must come to view with amazement the plea coming up from the Democratic party leadership in the Southern states to "let the South alone" when it beholds, as it must behold, the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas and Virginia, having, in round numbers, an aggregate of 5,000,000 male citizens of voting age, while, in the face of this fact, the entire delegation in Congress from these states was elected in 1910 upon an aggregate of but 950,000 ballots. It is not so much the South that this leadership would have let alone as it is the methods of those responsible for this system. The appeal of "let the South alone" is rather in their own behalf than in the behalf of the masses of the South who have not now and who have never had republican form of government. Of the 5,000,000 male citizens of

voting age in these states of the South, there are, approximately, 3,500,000 white and 1,500,000 Colored citizens. The aggregate vote polled by the Democratic party in these states in the last Presidential election is no more than half the white male citizenship and about equal to the number of Colored male citizens of voting age.

Notwithstanding the acts of repression, together with the spirit of intolerance and political despotism of this Southern oligarchy, the white masses of the South have become aroused to a consciousness of their situation. Within recent years, in several Southern States, they have made a struggle to disenthral themselves from the oppression of the Democratic party leadership. In North Carolina, Tennessee and in Alabama, there were unmistakable uprisings of the white masses. In Alabama, 115,000 ballots were polled against the oligarchy in 1892, which was driven into the sixteen black belt counties of the state as the only stronghold of the Democratic party. It then required the fraudulent return of 50,000 votes from these counties, where the colored male citizens of voting age, then not disfranchised, predominated, to save the continuance in power of the self-boasted party of white supremacy. It was the same sort of manipulation of black belt returns that enabled this so-called Democratic party to maintain control in Alabama in 1894 and in 1896, as was the case in 1892. This fraud condition in Alabama was duplicated in the state of Tennessee, as well is in Louisiana and other Southern states, during these years.

Guilty of these flagrant frauds, the oligarchy was all the while asserting itself as the champion of white supremacy, yet, the face of the election returns attested the fact that stuffed ballot boxes in the black belt were employed to overcome majorities cast in the election districts populated largely by white voters. A way was found, however, by which the hypocrisy of this situation was shown the American people. Candidates for Congress were nominated in several of the Alabama districts, as was done in several districts in other Southern states, with the view of making contests and developing the facts as to this condition through sworn evidence before the House of Representatives of the United States. Every precaution and pre-arrangement to this end was taken. As a result of this presentation of fact as to elections in various districts in Southern states there were forty Southern Democratic Congressmen unseated in the 1896 Congress.

When confronted with this new condition, the oligarchy then, as a political necessity, changed its political method of repression from that of brazen frauds to the present system of strategy, cunning and subterfuge that has become possible through the con-

niving and chicanery of existing disfranchisement laws. The astute leaders of the oligarchy have been wise enough to impress the American people that these disfranchisement laws are a so-called ballot reform or a more honorable way through which the South could eliminate the Colored voter, but the truth of it is that the political upheaval in the South, together with the exposures made in Congress, and the action by Congress, forced the turning away from black belt methods to disfranchisement juggling. That the white masses of the state of Alabama understood the disfranchisement motive of the suffrage acts, adopted in 1901, is shown by the fact that the white counties, in general, voted against the ratification of the present Constitution, while the ratification was obtained by false returns from the black belt counties under the usual frauds system then in operation. Not only was the ballot taken from Colored citizens of voting age, not only were they, without their consent, put in the attitude of voting their own disfranchisement, but more, the frauds returns, predicated upon the Colored male citizenship of voting age, went to override the ballots polled in opposition to disfranchisement and to annul the white majorities voting against these acts. The motive of a general law can best be judged by the results arising from its application. When the disfranchisement acts went into operation in Alabama there were 232,294 white and 181,471 Colored male citizens in the state of voting age, making a total of 413,765. The number of qualified voters in the state at present will not aggregate 150,000. Of the 180,000 Colored male citizens of voting age there are, perhaps, 3,000 permitted to register and to vote. The sweep of the disfranchisement acts in the South, and the motive prompting them, may be comprehended in contemplation of the Republican vote of 1,025,130 cast for McKinley in these dozen Southern states, before the enactment of these laws, as compared with the vote of 1,129,714 ballots cast in these states in 1904 for Parker, the Democratic candidate for President, after these laws had gone into effect. Surely no one can fail, with this statement of conditions before them, to realize what havoc has been wrought to ballot rights in the South by the swing of the disfranchisement Bourbon axe.

To cause national public sentiment to be tolerant of this outlawing of the American Constitution, it all has been put forward as a so-called Negro question, and a plan whereby the rule of the alleged best people of the South may be maintained. It is under this guise and cloak that tyranny has ever paraded. It has been so all through the history of the world. It was the best people of the South who were responsible for and who upheld the institu-

tion of slavery; it was the best people of the South who not only held the colored people in bondage, but held the white masses in political repression; it was the best people who organized the KuKlux, that the oligarchy might return to its power and methods; it was the best people who enacted statutes which have permitted peonage to be perpetrated upon a helpless race; it is the best people in whose communities defenceless colored people are now lynched, murdered, swindled, Jim Crowed, segregated, abused and vilified, while they are but mere helpless subject citizens; it is now the best people who come to the North with false representations about Colored people in the South, and with false statements about political conditions in the South, that the conscience of the North may remain dormant and pass over the system of minority government they have fostered and now perpetrate upon the masses; it is the best people who seek to have the North believe that their policies and methods are essential to keep intact the integrity of the white race, while, in fact, the complexion of the colored race in the South is growing lighter, and, as far as law and legality goes, fatherless Colored children are coming into the world being assigned by their white fathers side by side with the other subject citizens, and yet, in the face of all this, the absurd representations about the preservation of the white racial integrity is being constantly agitated by those who know that moral statutes, which regulate the conduct of white men, and not political persecution of Colored men, is one direct way by which may be kept the complexion of the white race, if it is desired, reserved to the white race.

Behind the intrigue, beneath the cunning, underneath the beclouding of the real problem arising from the South, there is no so-called Negro problem. All this appeal to prejudice, all this distortion of fact, must, in the end, be pressed aside. The appeal must be heard by the people of the South, who constitute this political despotism, that any political party founded upon just principles and guided by honest purposes can dare to trust the voice of all the people.

The lofty conception of human justice, held by the fathers, that citizens who shared taxation and expense of government should have voice in government, is deeply implanted in the provisions of the American Constitution. It may be seen that the founders of our government did not desire the rights of the American citizen to be trampled underfoot, for Article IV, Sec. 2, says: "The citizens of each state shall be entitled to all the privileges and immunities of citizens of the several states."

Then, there is, in the Constitution, the declaration of Article IV, Sec. 2: "The United States shall guarantee to every state in this Union a republican form of government." This declaration carries with it the guarantee that citizens of the United States, residing in the several states, shall have participation in our republican form of government. No state, except in violation of the Constitution, save for crime specified in the Constitution, may deny to the citizen privileges and immunities enjoyed by the citizens in the several states.

That there should be no question as to the right of citizenship of Colored people, Article XIV, Section 1, was adopted. It declares: "All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the states wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States." To make it beyond controversy that the Colored citizen was admitted to full sovereign citizenship, Article XV, Sec. 1, was adopted. It says: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of color, or previous condition of servitude." So it will be observed how, step by step, the Constitution has emphasized the nationality and the sovereignty rights of the American citizen and how it is that the War Amendments put, beyond question, the sovereignty right of the ballot in the hands of the Colored Americans.

It is beyond dispute that the Southern states have enacted laws which have denied citizens their rights in government and it is beyond controversy that were these citizens residents in the several states other than those of the South, which are outlawing the American Constitution, that they would be permitted the full exercise of the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States in accordance with the guarantees of the Federal Constitution. The disfranchised citizen in Alabama can only throw off the yoke of this oppression, of his own effort, by being able to gather together his belongings and locating in any number of the several states where the constitutional provisions are not yet nullified.

Fully confident of the righteousness of this cause, unreservedly reliant upon the knowledge of the truthfulness of this presentation of the conditions, this problem is submitted to the thought and the action of the people of the United States for their proper adjustment.

THE REORGANIZATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL

A Complete Reorganization

To the NEW REVIEW:

On each one of the three questions asked in your manifesto I vote emphatically and unqualifiedly, "Yes!"

It seems clear that the Socialist movement everywhere must undergo a process of reorganization. If in the development of events it becomes manifest that the Socialist Party of this country is dominated by those in whom Nationalism is a stronger motive than the desire for international solidarity of the working class, then a split in the party must come. It is doubtful if in any country where there is a Socialist movement, the revolutionary or international faction of the party is strong enough to dominate the movement; hence it seems almost unavoidable that a split must come in each separate national organization. Many will regret the apparently impending dissolution of party organization, but they may be reminded of the biological principle that in some organisms fission is a necessary means of perpetuation and development of the species.

The international or revolutionary factions in the several nations must affiliate closely, much more closely than the old Socialist parties in the International of the ante-bellum period. The new movement must be one international, revolutionary, working-class party of the whole world. Whether it retains the designation "Socialist" or abandons that and adopts a different name is a matter of minor importance.

I wish to offer for your consideration a statement of principles or cardinal points of doctrine and practice which I deem essential as the basis for existence of an international, revolutionary, proletarian party.

1. The party must be organized on a strictly working-class basis. All reformistic tendencies in the interest of the middle class must be relentlessly excluded.

2. International unity; there must be a close affiliation of the sections of the party in the several countries, and unity of action.

3. Uncompromising opposition to militarism in every form and in any degree.

4. Industrial unionism; the industrial or economic phase of organization must be held as of equal importance with the political. The industrial union must be recognized as the organ for the administration of industry after the downfall of capitalism.

5. The general strike; to be advocated both as the means of preventing war and of securing the control of industry by the workers.

6. Political power is to be sought for the ultimate purpose of putting an end to the political state, to clear the ground in order that the industrial organization of the workers may have unhampered freedom in the administration of industry.

7. Uniformity of Socialist propaganda throughout the world.

8. Advocacy of freedom of migration from any nation to any other nation; such freedom to be qualified only by the requirements of a reasonable quarantine system.

9. All propaganda and tactics must conform to the principle that under capitalism the wage-earners are exploited as producers, not as consumers.

I conceive these nine principles to be all interrelated in such a way as to form an integral system. Nearly all the principles have been in one way or another violated or disregarded by the Socialist party of this country.

Recent events in the Socialist movement indicate that the process of fission is well under way. T. E. Latimer, in an article on "Executive Committee Rule" (February number of the *International Socialist Review*), explaining the matter of the Finnish controversy, says, "This controversy has

brought the party organization to the parting of the ways." The Finnish daily, *Sosialisti*, of Duluth, Minn., in the special (English) issue for January 13, publishes a signed editorial by William E. Towne, which commences, "The exodus has begun." In the course of this editorial, he says:—

"The action of the National Executive Committee is the bugle call to action for the fighters and the revolutionists. . . . It means that we are either going to have a revolutionary party predicated firmly upon the class struggle and adhering to working-class issues and tactics in keeping with the inspiring principles of Socialism, or we are going to have another party in the field, and that a fighting one, not a trimming one."

I have been thinking for some time that the strain between the two factions in the Socialist party was approaching the breaking point, and have been expecting that the actual break would probably occur at the national party convention of 1916 in the form of a "bolt" by the revolutionary minority. Events of the last few weeks seem to foreshadow the birth of a new party even before that time.

EDWARD S. SMITH.

Warren, O.

A Symphony of Nations

To the NEW REVIEW:

Nationalism and Socialism mutually exclusive? On the contrary, the aim of Socialism, as I understand it, is to bring about the full, complete and uninterrupted development of national culture, science and art. In other words, our aim should be to have, if I may use the term, "a symphony of nations," each nation contributing what is best in it to the wealth and happiness of mankind. What we want is an *international* humanity, with the accent on the international, which presupposes different nations—working towards one common end, the happiness of mankind. What we should strive to eradicate is chauvinism and not nationalism.

The second question I answer in the affirmative, and the third in the negative.

H. W. FREEMAN.

Houston, Texas.

Opposes an Internationalist Policy

To the NEW REVIEW:

I am very sorry to see that you contemplate the policy of *opposing nationalism in all its forms*. I believe you make a serious mistake, which will greatly detract from the value of the NEW REVIEW; indeed, in my opinion, practically destroy it.

I hoped, and from its previous attitude of absolute impartiality and high standard, had good reason to expect, that the NEW REVIEW would become a great national paper, such as the *Neue Zeit* was in its best days, opening its columns to *all* views and discussions which stand on the basis of economic Socialism: to the political Socialist as well as the industrial Socialist and syndicalist; to the anti-national internationalist as well as the nationalist, to the exponent of co-operation with labor unions as well as the one who considers it hopeless to convert the unions to Socialism, and thereby opposes them, etc.; to the absolute opponent of war, whether political or industrial, as well as the one who concedes the justification of war under certain conditions of capitalist society.

Such a paper does not exist at present, and would be very desirable and useful, and could do great work towards socialization of public thought amongst all classes of present society.

But as soon as you adopt any definite policy, no matter how justified it may appear to you, the paper is merely one of the large crop of anti-nationalist Socialist publications, which will spring up especially in countries such as America, where Socialism is in the earliest stages of development.

We must realize that to-day, if a vote were taken of all the Socialists of the world, that is, all those who accept and agree to work for socialization of society, whether military war is justified under certain conditions or not, the overwhelming majority would vote in favor. If we really believe in a social

democracy, then we must accept the decision of the majority of Socialists.

If the Editors personally are opposed to nationalism, they can represent and defend their views under their signature, just as others may represent the opposite view under their signature; but to establish an editorial policy in favor of one particular viewpoint or interpretation, necessarily must detract materially from the value of the paper as independent medium of Socialist discussion, a function which is more needed in America than anywhere else, due to the centrifugal tendencies which over and over again have handicapped the progress of Socialist propaganda.

Schenectady, N. Y.

CHARLES P. STEINMETZ.

[This letter of Mr. Steinmetz arrived just as we were going to press. His important criticism and suggestions will be given the fullest consideration at the next meeting of our Board of Editors. In the meantime, it may be pointed out that the proposal to adopt an internationalist policy for the NEW REVIEW was not intended to and its adoption would not, interfere or abrogate our functions as an independent forum of independent Socialist thought.]

A Basically Economic International

To the NEW REVIEW:

The reorganization of the International had better be left to the future and the course of evolution which conditions will then demand. Magazine discussion will build up, primarily, an ideal out of touch with concrete reality—in other words, restore the old status that constituted the basic defect of the old International. When the war is over, commerce will continue as it did before it, with this difference, that its operation will be more carefully guarded against the disruptive effects of war than it has been heretofore; for, if this war has made one thing evident, it is the international interdependence of all nations. All the other old factors of civilization, such as international exchange and capital, travel, communication, immigration and the thousand and one things that go to make all racial and national groups interlocking and alike will also more strongly prevail, and for the same reasons. In these likelihoods lie our hopes.

We hear much of the nation as a race entity. Nevertheless, the recent national developments are more marked because of economic sameness than racial diversity. Japan tends to become more occidental and capitalistic, for instance, than it was formerly conceived to be. Instead of the Japan of tribal and feudalistic viewpoints, we now have a Japan with an increasing world-psychology. And the alacrity with which China uses American locomotives and imitates Republican forms only makes the point stronger.

With nations tending to more marked international interdependence and economic sameness, we may hope for the same world-economic classes that make for Socialism on an international scale. We may then hope for the further growth of the economic internationalism, the revolutionary unionism, that was the menace of capitalism prior to the war, and that played such an important part during it in both Russia and Italy. With war readjustment will come an accentuated return of the class struggle. It is already in the air. Labor will, as usual in all wars, find itself the victim, with Capital the victor! Then will Labor regain its sober senses once more and "there will be something doing" both nationally and internationally.

What we should strive to do is to make the next international a basically economic and not an ideally political organization. Let us learn to profit from the failures of the day.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

JUSTUS EBERT.

Socialism Not Against Nationalism

To the NEW REVIEW:

I should answer the three questions submitted in the January number of the NEW REVIEW as follows:

1. Are Nationalism and Socialism mutually exclusive?

In my opinion, No. No more than Religion and Socialism are mutually

exclusive. If the present war teaches us anything it is that the Nationalist "feeling" is deeper than acquired Socialist "reason." We are all subject to this feeling; it is even more profound, it seems to me, than the religious feeling, probably because it is more obvious, more concrete. It follows, therefore, that Socialist tactics should treat Nationalism on a par with Religion.

2. Should a test of Socialist Internationalism consist in relentless opposition to Militarism, and the steadfast refusal of Socialist legislators to vote military appropriations, whatever the pretext may be?

Opposition to Militarism has nothing to do with Internationalism. Socialists, whether they call themselves Nationalists or Internationalists, should certainly oppose Militarism, in any shape or form.

Modern Militarism is the crystalization of Capitalism. As Capitalism depends for its existence on force: force of money, force of ignorance, force of trickery, it must of necessity support the ultimate physical expression of force—the club of the police and the gun of the soldier. Under Capitalism every man is an enemy to the other, every country an enemy of its neighbor. And as the individual looks for protection to a policeman, so does a Capitalist country to its army and navy. Now, the more powerful the country, the more secure does the capitalist feel in his mission of grabbing, whatever it may be: work of another, natural resources, foreign concessions. The army is always at the call of the "Country," and the Country is the Capitalist. . . . Thus Capitalism and Militarism go hand in hand, and whoever opposes the first must also oppose the second. . . .

Yet I should not call opposition to Militarism a test of Internationalism. One may be a Nationalist—in the sense of loving his home, or a certain portion of the globe where he was born, or raised, or passed some happy moments: and preferring one set of friends or one class of people to another. And, with all that, one may be an excellent Socialist and an opponent of all physical force and bullyism.

3. Should the International be reorganized to include International Socialists alone, with "Nationalistic Socialists" rigidly denied admission?

This question carries its own answer. What are International Socialists? Rockefeller's migratory birds? Up to the present, we know American Socialists, or German, or English, or French. Our particular residences give us a particular stamp, like our occupations; which is good Socialist theory. Should the war result in a United States of Europe, we shall have European, American, Asiatic, and other Socialists. Of course, the Co-operative Commonwealth knows no border line. As believers in that, we are all Internationalists. But this does not in any way, to my mind, exclude the "nationalistic" feeling, in the sense described above, which is deeply rooted in every man's heart.

Long live the International—composed of free, independent, self-respecting, intelligent nationalities!

A. A. HELLER.

New York City.

A Travesty

To the NEW REVIEW:

Our American press is rich in imagination. It has created "Kings of Hoboes" and "Queens of Anarchists." Lately, the high-toned New York *Post* has added to this gallery of distinguished altitudes a "National Chairman of the Socialist Party." That designation has repeatedly appeared as introduction to authorized interviews with Morris Hillquit.

Neither Jeff Davis nor Emma Goldman, as far as known, protest against the titles bestowed upon them. Presumably they take them as cheap and vulgar jokes. Whether Mr. Hillquit assumes the same attitude toward his new title is less certain. He seems to feel that if he is not National Chairman, *i.e.*, Chief Political, he ought to be. Or if not that, at least the "Main Guy." That part he plays all too frequently. His latest performance is his article in *The Call* correcting A. M. Simons. Simons is considerably worked up over the collapse of the International. Hillquit tells us: "Be calm."

In 1806, after the disaster of Jena, the Governor of Berlin issued a proclamation, beginning: "His Majesty has lost a battle. Now it is the first duty of every citizen to be quiet." Hillquit's utterance is a travesty of this statesmanship: "The International has met its Jena. Now it is the first duty of every Socialist to be calm."

MOSES OPPENHEIMER.

New York City.

Reorganize the American Movement

To the NEW REVIEW:

"The International disintegrated because Nationalism assumed supremacy in the councils of the Socialist Movement," says your manifesto. It follows that if the integrity of the International is to be preserved the cause of its disintegration, Nationalism, must be driven out of the Socialist Movement.

Theoretically we cry "Workers of all Countries, Unite." Actually the International has fostered a condition that has given the lie to our most cherished slogan. Socialists who formerly preached unity, solidarity are now at each others' throats. What a travesty on our aspirations!

War springs from Nationalism, and to strike at war the blow must be struck at Nationalism. Nationalism comprises geographic subdivisions, is maintained by exclusively national economic interests, and further strengthened by the cunning bourgeois exploitation of language, customs, creeds, etc.

International Socialism recognizes no geographic boundaries. Labor power is an International commodity, has universal racial characteristics, speaks the same language and has the same needs the world over—its emancipation; an emancipation that can only result from labor's strength; and this strength can only be acquired through unity of forces. Segmentation and artificial boundaries, exclusive national interests, do not make for the solidarity of labor. Socialism seeks to articulate in action the physical characteristic of the internationality of labor.

The Nationalist seeks to maintain the narrow national limits of the bourgeois state with their provocation to war.

The state rests on property, is concerned with property relations and legislates in the interest of property rights. Socialism rests on Social relations, is concerned with human relations. Nationalism is political government; Socialism industrial democracy. Nationalism rests upon the principle of exclusion, internationalism upon co-operation. The two are antagonistic and cannot coexist in the Socialist movement.

It is said that "true patriotism" will never be destroyed. The destruction of artificial national boundaries does not preclude a sense of love one may entertain for a particular locality, its natural charms, the place of our birth, intimate associations that produce endearing memories. Such memories need not be effaced. They are never provocative of hate, and do not constitute Nationalism. Let us be clear on this point. Nationalism is economic, political; it is an instrument of bourgeois interests and economic aggression. Love of one's place of birth, language, race, is temperamental, psychological; it is a cultural force, just as the love and assertion of one's individuality. Nationalism negates this love; its actions trample on race, language, destroy homes and subordinate the cultural to political necessity. But Nationalism cunningly inter-weaves its own materialistic motives into this fabric of love of race and language.

Militarism—armaments—instruments for the maintenance and expansion of the nation, cannot be included and supported in the very movement that repudiates and seeks to destroy national barriers.

Militarism is a ruling class power utilized to safeguard the booty of home capitalists from the aggressive designs of foreign capitalists, to secure privileges in trade, and to keep the workers in subjection. Armaments, instruments of war, no amount of "defensive" and "aggressive" hypocrisy can change this fact; and when Socialists vote military budgets they vote for potential war and the continued subjection of the working class. Revolutionists can hardly hope to capture for their own uses the organized military force of their nations; militarism is securely controlled by the ruling class, as proven in Europe. Increase of armament means increased power for the

ruling class; and surely it is not the mission of the working class to strengthen the power of the oppressor it seeks to destroy.

The reorganized International must not alone exclude Socialists in favor of militarism; it must exclude Socialists opposed to militarism, but who are nationalists. Ramsay MacDonald and Keir Hardie opposed the war; but they are nationalists to the bone. The new International should concentrate all its forces in developing the industrial solidarity of labor. For only revolutionary industrial unionism, supported by revolutionary political action, can function in that process of revolutionary actions necessary for the overthrow of capitalism.

Such an International would first require the re-organization of its unit representatives,—the re-organization of the Socialist movement of each particular nation. Our own task, the most practical contribution we can make to the re-organization of the International, is to bend our efforts to the task of re-organizing the American Socialist movement along revolutionary, anti-nationalistic and class-union lines.

New York City.

JEANNETTE D. PEARL.

The International Lives

To the NEW REVIEW:

THE NEW REVIEW of January, 1915, publishes a manifesto addressed "To the Socialist Public," saying that the International is being reorganized and assuming that the International is disintegrated. In other quarters also, there seems to be an idea growing that the International is defunct.

As one of the principal founders of the New International in the early 80's, I would energetically protest against any such assumption. Further, I sincerely hope American comrades will not rush into print on questions of abstract theory when dealing with practical matters of fact, such as the history of international organization. If, on your side of the Atlantic, a cataclysm occurred, such as an earthquake or widespread floods which interrupted the communications between two or more States, should we raise our arms to heaven and bewail the disappearance of the United States of America?

The International exists to-day, as it did yesterday, only communications in certain directions are difficult because of the war.

There are material obstacles that prevent a full gathering of the Bureau, and there are very good political reasons why it had better defer such meeting till the situation becomes more clearly defined. Personally, I think that the secret agents of the Prussian government employed to influence the Socialist movement, especially in neutral countries, so as to soften the fall of Prussia, should not only be discovered—as some of them already are—but publicly denounced, before we take action. In the current number of *Justice* of January 7th, I describe the policy pursued by some of these German agents.

In any case, the International exists and will re-assemble and continue its business as soon as the means for traveling and international intercourse open again. Comrade Vandervelde, whom I meet constantly, has not the slightest intention of resigning his Presidency of the International Bureau. The war has done more to convince, in any case the British public, of the need of Socialism than years of mere theoretical propaganda. If, further, the Prussian methods of domination can be destroyed by this war, we may be able to get rid of one of the greatest causes of weakness that existed within the ranks of the International.

It was the Prussian jack-boot methods that broke the old International. It was the Germans, under Prussian leadership, who did their best to prevent the reconstruction of the International in the 80's. To this I can bear witness for most of the negotiations passed through my hands. Then when, in spite of German opposition, the International was reconstituted, they started, in 1889, a rival International. But the current was too strong for them and they had to fall into the ranks, so that by the time of the next, the Brussels Congress of 1891, there remained but one International. Though thus forced to enter what had become the one and only Socialist International, it was always the Germans who strove to postpone congresses and defer action. Now, however, that the German influence is likely, as a consequence of the

war, to be very considerably reduced, if not done away with altogether, the International will become a much more active body and its endeavors will produce a better harvest.

The International is not dead. To-day the world is beginning to realize that the big German Social-Democratic vote was mainly a vote "agin' the government." It was more Democratic than Socialist; and even then, not very Democratic. Socialists of all countries, being now better informed, it will be easier to remove the principal obstacle in the way of international organization. The International will flourish, but not for the promotion of any particular set of theories. Theory and organization are two totally different things. That was the German mistake. Socialists have no army with which they can impose an orthodoxy and shoot down those who do not fully adopt their theories. In 1793, the French Republican said:—"Be my brother or I will kill you." To-day the Prussian says, "Adopt my Kultur or I will shoot you." The International will endeavor to give free scope to the idiosyncrasies of all races and peoples and will be all the more harmonious for being less theoretically consistent. The International is not dead, it is about to receive a new lease of life.

London, Eng.

A. S. HEADINGLEY.

No Pseudo-Socialist International!

To the NEW REVIEW:

Your invitation for an expression of views on the coming reorganization of the International is timely. The sad spectacle of the downfall of the old International has brought confusion, despair and shame in the ranks of Socialists, and amazement among thinking non-Socialists. Those to whom this downfall is still a puzzle, and even those who have accepted the various apologetic explanations of the leaders, will find in the three questions which you have submitted for their consideration an invaluable aid in arriving at the only true solution of this puzzle. And this solution is *that the International was betrayed not by Socialism but by pseudo-Socialism.*

The attitude of the official Socialist parties towards the present European war has shown that what we so fondly and proudly believed to be the growth of true Socialism was only an illusion. It was Socialism shorn of its revolutionary spirit; it was Socialism trimmed, emasculated, made respectable and even quite acceptable to the ruling classes. What Louis C. Fraina, in his article, "The Future of Socialism" (NEW REVIEW, January, 1915), says of the Social-Democracy of Germany, as being fundamentally a bourgeois republican movement, can more or less justly be said of all official Socialist parties in other countries, which have been influenced by or modeled on the German plan. The movement fell under the domination of bourgeois liberals and radicals. As bourgeois those leaders remained true to the characteristic bourgeois ideal—nationalism, and it was but natural for them to lead the obedient, fooled and betrayed proletarian masses to the shambles. Whether this betrayal was premeditated or not is immaterial. The fact of the betrayal remains, and the historical and psychological reasons of it are apparent. What then shall the attitude of the class-conscious proletariat be towards this fact? There can be only one answer to this question: *the complete repudiation of its old leaders and their tactics.* Nay more, the proletariat must draw a lesson from this betrayal not to follow blindly any leaders; it must learn to retain the reins of its movement in its own hands.

1. *Nationalism and Socialism are mutually exclusive.* If this is heresy, then I would humbly ask our "leaders" and "fathers" to expurgate the Communist Manifesto and to change Marx's battle-cry, "workers of the world unite" to "workers of the world rise against each other!" I would also suggest that they amend the other fundamental teaching of "old" Socialism, viz.: that the workers of the world have no other enemy but the capitalists, by adding "*except when the capitalists of different countries quarrel. In such a case it is the duty of the workers to defend the capitalists of their respective countries with the last drop of their blood.*" This would be consistent with their conception of Socialism and with their attitude towards the present war, and would prevent the spread of unauthorized, pernicious notions about Socialism.

2. *Relentless opposition to militarism shall be a test of Socialist Internationalism.*

Capitalism, being based on exploitation of the working-class, can maintain itself only by armed force. As long as the masses are submissive and quiet, the church, the school, the judiciary and the police are sufficient to maintain "capitalist order" and to keep the masses in subjection. But when these institutions fail, as in times of popular unrest and rebellion against unbearable conditions, the military is called upon to crush and drown in blood the aspirations of the workers. When not so employed at home, the army is made use of for the conquest of foreign markets for the capitalists. *But never in the history of the world has it been employed in defense of the true interests of the proletariat.* And in all times, whether in peace or in war, the army has served to overawe the masses and inspire them with a wholesome fear and respect for the power of the State.

3. *Under no conditions shall "Nationalist-Socialists" be admitted to the reorganized International.*

It is an old truism that the most dangerous enemy is the one that comes to you in the disguise of a friend. The old leaders of the Socialist movement have proven themselves to be traitors to this movement. Therefore they can have no place in the new International. But already there are signs of feverish activity among the old Socialist leaders in all countries to capture the coming International. The revolutionary proletariat must strain every effort to defeat the old politicians in their machinations and, failing in this, they must organize an International of their own.

DR. LEO CAPLAN.

St. Louis, Mo.

What Is Socialism?

To the NEW REVIEW:

Before you so speedily proceed to organize the "New International," I for one would like to ask you a question, that I think is very pertinent and timely at this stage of developments, to wit, *What is Socialism?* Until that is determined fully and once for all, then I say that the proposition of a reorganization of the International leaves me up in the air.

In view of all that has occurred in the warring nations during the last six months, and even before that, did we teach Socialism, or did we deceive ourselves and delude others?

True, all the blunders and crimes of Socialists during this war, and before it, have been charged up to "the leaders." Truly a pitiful subterfuge!

Many years ago, Marx and Engels observed several types or breeds of Socialists. How many types we have now is beyond me. The article of Hourwich betrays the fact of diversity of types; and shows clearly that you yourselves are guessing. *What is Socialism?*

If we squarely meet this question, we will probably find that our ideas of Socialism are and have been decidedly hazy.

Are we going to continue the same "go as you please" sort of Socialism in the future as in the past? Does Socialism mean one thing in Germany and another thing in France? Should the Socialism of the United States differ from the Socialism of Canada or Mexico? And if these local or national differences exist, how can a "New International" be any more successful than the old one? Is Socialism to remain a petty little party matter to be boxed and squared a little differently at each petty party convention? Or is Socialism to have a revolutionary conception?

A new International? Founded upon what? Predicated upon the Bourgeois Socialism of Germany and the United States? Predicated upon the doctrine of State Capitalism that certain of our "leaders" are so industriously promulgating at present?

How can we teach Socialism when we do not ourselves know what Socialism is? Let us determine what Socialism is. Teach Socialism, and the logic of events will tell us when to re-form the International.

If Socialism is, as we claim, a "science," very good. Let us then make it scientific; and once for all, place it upon a solid foundation of historic, scientific, and economic accuracy.

Fraina opens his article in the January NEW REVIEW thus: "There was no collapse of *Socialism* in Europe," and Fraina is right, because it is now a debatable question if there ever was any Socialism in Europe. Certainly not in Germany. And how could that collapse that never was? Then Fraina speaks of "Socialist illusions." Aye, that is just it,—illusions promulgated by mere "doctrinaires of the phrase."

Let us have done with illusions. Let us have Socialism or nothing. Let us be frank with ourselves at least, and admit that we have been indulging in illusions. When we find out what Socialism is, we may be better qualified to re-organize the International.

H. A. GOFF.

Allegheny, Pa.

[EDITORS' NOTE: This letter was sent by the writer to Isaac A. Hourwich, who made a brief reply from which we quote the following suggestive paragraphs:

"In general, I believe that the Socialist movement of the world has reached the same stage as the Christian Church in the time of the Reformation. The question, 'What is Socialism?' like the earlier question, 'What is Christianity?' can evidently not be answered in a uniform way. With the spread of Socialism, as with the spread of Christianity, there must evidently be many interpretations of Socialism.

"In this respect, the development of Socialism does not differ from the development of any other scientific theory. How can a conflict of views be avoided in social science, which is more complicated than natural science?"]

An Old International Congress

To the NEW REVIEW:

Undoubtedly, the new International will produce a new form of Congress; the Socialist congress at Copenhagen was probably the last of its kind.

I recall vividly the sessions of the Copenhagen Congress; sessions which fully justified La Monte's indictment of the "tyranny of Prussian doctrinaire disciplinarians;"—a tyranny which the new international movement must be freed from.

On the opening day of the Congress a group of Syndicalists distributed a poster printed in four languages. In English it read in part:

"Once again you are meeting in Congress with the question, 'The emancipation of the Working Class!' You know it, Farisees—you must know that your political juggling only benefits yourselves, that the laboring class does not get one atom nearer the goal through your sitting in the legislative assemblies—but that your labor only helps to send the laborers off to sleep. You know that the unemployed demand bread—that the laboring class demand deeds," etc.

Hundreds of these posters were refused a reading; but a few were read and commented upon. Mme. Songue, a "Red" from Paris, assistant on Gustave Hervé's paper, remarked ironically, "The Congress is not interested in Syndicalism or the working class, they come here to congratulate each other."

On the way to Berlin from Copenhagen a group of delegates discussed the work of the Congress. Said a tall German delegate to Clara Zetkin—a brilliant woman in every way—"What would you have had the Congress do?" "One thing it should have done but failed to do," she said vehemently; "discuss the subject of Syndicalism or Industrial Organization. Right or wrong, Syndicalism is a working-class movement and whatever is vital to the workers should be equally vital to a Socialist Congress."

"A first-class party machine has been built," said a Polish comrade, "and the aim of its makers and promoters, it would seem, is to prevent any friction of its parts."

Other comments were: "A political machine is necessary; but too much machine defeats the object aimed at. Machines should exist for men, not men for machines."

Organize, organize has been the German Socialist slogan for over half a century. The German idea of organization and tactics permeates the "International." The Social Democracy of Germany, like its Government, has been

highly centralized, and in many instances shows a ruthless disregard of the growing needs of the workers. "Court Favors" has made the Socialist deputies forget the object of Socialism: abolition of wage slavery. We cannot resist the thought that had the Socialist workers of Germany been organized industrially as they were politically—organized in their respective shops, mines, mills and factories; aflame to the need of REAL solidarity; had they trusted their mass power more, and their leaders less; had they been fully conscious of their slave condition, *that they were not "Patriots"*; had they known and felt the true meaning of the words—"Workers of the World Unite"—they would not to-day be food for Camian and Carrion.

If history teaches anything it is that delegated power is no longer power to those who have delegated it. The story of the Paris Commune is the story of "delegated Power"—too much respect for bourgeois opinion was then, as it is to-day, the great weakness of the proletariat. "One of the most unfortunate characteristics of the leaders of the Commune," says Belfort Bax, "was their sensitiveness to bourgeois public opinion. The first thing for the leader of a revolutionary movement to learn is A HEALTHY contempt for the official public opinion of the 'Civilized World.'" If we in America, as in Europe, could inoculate the toilers with a wholesome contempt for the ruck of the so-called "upper classes" and many of our labor and political misleaders, the battle would be practically won. No government, be it that of a party or a nation, should be in the hands of ego-maniacs, play-actors, place-hunters. From now on let the truth be writ as with a pen of iron on the tablets of our memory: "*The emancipation of working class must be accomplished by the workers themselves.*"

This war will give rise to new conditions, says Pannekoek. "And out of these conditions a new International of Labor will grow, more firmly founded, more strongly organized, more powerful and more Socialistic than the one that now perished." So be it! The change will surely be felt in the United States. Here, as elsewhere, the Socialist party should make clear to the workers that the form of Socialist government we seek to realize must be *industrial*, not political; that its aim is the abolition of the political State as a form of government; its ideal being a form of society in which representation shall come from the industries instead of as now from political constituencies. The aim and object of our movement fully understood, the necessary corresponding tactics will be forthcoming and the new international should be organized accordingly.

Salt Lake City, Utah.

GEO. N. FALCONER.

Calls for a Referendum

To The NEW REVIEW:

Your manifesto to "The Socialist Public" is opportune. Your questions go to the root of the matter, and I fail to see any reason why they should not be thrashed out by the Party membership right now.

Are nationalism and Socialism mutually exclusive? Who can doubt it? To me the *international* appeal of Socialism is its greatest glory. "Workers of the World unite" cannot mean the calling into being of nationalistic groups retaining all their race antagonisms and prejudices and concerned only with their own internal affairs. Give me rather the vision of Marx and Engels of a world-wide united proletariat pressing together toward the goal of liberty and economic freedom.

To your second question I reply emphatically YES. Because only by so doing can the standard of true internationalism be maintained. The action of the German Socialists has done us immense harm, because we had always declared that there could be no war while their numerical strength was so great. The people have been taught that Socialism stood unreservedly opposed to war and we *must* do something to remove the stain and prevent the recurrence of such a disgraceful episode as the German "Socialist" support of the war-crazed Kaiser. To question three I would again give an emphatic YES. And above all, let us have REAL *workingmen* on the International representation—proletarii—men who have no country, and who will therefore be more apt to be true internationalists.

I recognize that the organization of the New International on these lines will be no easy matter, but I believe that the interests of the movement demand drastic measures.

You deserve much commendation for the splendid selection of articles included in the NEW REVIEW. Especially interesting, illuminating and representative are the articles by Anton Pannekoek, Wm. English Walling, Louis C. Fraina, and A. M. Simons' article in the February "Digest." By all means thrash out this matter of Nationalism and Internationalism. Let us all know and realize where we stand—and why. I am sure that the great majority of our party membership subscribe to the views so lucidly stated by the comrades mentioned above; and while sincerely advocating the continued discussion of the subject, I would also suggest that we might with advantage demand a referendum appeal to the whole membership in the United States and Canada. Let us know where we do stand, and who are our true Socialists. Let the issue be clear and unmistakably defined. And possibly this will open up the way to rid the movement of the "Nationalist-Socialists" who are bound to retard the future growth and influence of our movement unless they are thrown out.

Kerns, Ont., Canada.

CHARLES M. THOMPSON,
Sec'y, Local 95, S. D. P.

FREE SPEECH AND THE WAR

BY THEODORE SCHROEDER

This present European struggle is not only the greatest war the world has ever known, but it is the greatest war of the world's history from the standpoint of principle. It is the first war ever waged which involves the most fundamental of all liberties, Free Speech.

While seeking to discover in commercial rivalry and the lust for power the hidden motive of this war, we must not forget that in this as in any war there is involved a struggle for human rights. Here, as often, the struggle has been obscured by the other factors, some of them sordid, some idealistic. But that struggle, and the principle involved, can be discerned in the events which precipitated the war.

The diplomatic correspondence between Austria and Servia reveals it pretty clearly. It shows a conflict involving the question of the freedom of transmission of ideas. It shows moreover, by implication, the means of avoiding such conflicts, in a clear understanding and general agreement among nations as to these fundamental liberties.

The first Austrian note calls attention to anti-Austrian agitation on Servian territory which has resulted in disturbances of the peace along the border and finally resulted, so it was claimed, in the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand on June 28th, 1914.

After a detailed recital of these grievances the Austro-Hungarian Government made certain specific demands, the first of which embodied the principle of all the rest.

This first demand was as follows: "To suppress any publications which incite to hatred and contempt of the Austro-Hun-

garian monarchy and the general tendency of which is directed against its territorial integrity."

The second demand was for the suppression of certain Servian societies "addicted to propaganda against the Austro-Hungarian monarchy."

The third demand was for the elimination from public instruction of everything "which might serve to foment the propaganda against Austro-Hungary."

The fourth demand was to eliminate from Servian military service "all officers and functionaries guilty of" similar propaganda.

The ninth demand was for an explanation as to certain Servian officials who had expressed hostility to Austro-Hungary.

All the other demands relate only to the means of making the abridgments of Free Speech effective and to insure punishment of the assassin of the Archduke, and the suppression of disorders along the border.

The Servian Government acceded to the demand for punishment of the assassin in its own tribunals in the due course of law, but refused to allow Austrian officials to participate in the prosecution. It also, substantially, acceded to the other demands. But on the Free Speech issue there was a disposition to defend or ignore much that has been said and done, and a manifest unwillingness to proceed with an arbitrary suppression of freedom of utterance.

The Servian attitude is timidly stated as follows: "The Royal Government [of Servia] cannot be held responsible for manifestations of a private nature, such as newspaper articles and the peaceful work of societies—manifestations which occur in almost all countries as a matter of course and which as a general rule escape official control."

However, the Servian Government agreed upon proof to eliminate objectionable school propaganda and to suppress societies "which shall [in future] agitate against Austro-Hungary." It promised to eliminate from military service all found guilty of overt acts against Austro-Hungary and to explain all alleged hostile remarks by Servian officials upon the charges being made specific. Only as to the specific issues of Free Speech the Servian Government denied the suppression demanded by Austro-Hungary, but promised to submit to the next "Skupshtina" (the Servian legislative body) an amendment to the press laws punishing in the severest manner incitements to hate and contempt of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy.

Furthermore, "It [the Servian Government] undertakes at

the forthcoming revision of the Constitution to introduce in Article XXII of the Constitution an amendment whereby the above publications may be confiscated which is at present categorically forbidden by the terms of Article XXII of the Constitution," of Serbia.

This makes it apparent that Austro-Hungary demanded of Serbia the suppression of freedom of utterance although the laws and Constitution of Serbia guaranteed that freedom as to the particular agitation in question, and that Serbia timidly defended her Free Speech Laws and Constitution, but agreed to submit their amendment to proper tribunals.

The other demands to Austro-Hungary were substantially agreed to. However, owing to Servian reluctance to suppress freedom of utterance for agitators against Austro-Hungary, the latter declared: "Servia's note is filled with the spirit of dishonesty, which clearly lets it be seen that the Servian Government is not seriously determined to put an end to the culpable tolerance it hitherto has extended to intrigues against the Austro-Hungarian monarchy," and that "the concessions actually made by Serbia become insignificant . . . while our request that measures be taken against that section of the Servian press hostile to Austro-Hungary has been declined." Then came the declaration of war.

The action of Serbia does not mean that its monarch has any adequate understanding of the importance of free speech, or any religious devotion to it. Neither does it mean that the Austrian monarch had any less contempt for free speech than our average citizen, nor that he was any more arbitrary or lawless in his effort to suppress free speech than is the average American court. But it does illustrate the truth that all human activities, consciously or otherwise, involve issues of principle which, if adequately understood and always accorded unquestioned supremacy in curbing our primitive impulses, would help to avert tyranny and war.

By demanding the suppression of Free Speech the *one* belligerent hoped to achieve his concealed and unworthy ends; by upholding it, the *other* sought to maintain his contrary purposes. Independent of these ends no war over free speech would ever have occurred. Assuming that the unavowed ends were equally unjustifiable, Austria in addition to the improper ends insisted upon the use of unjustifiable means, in its demand for a violation of the fundamental principle of Free Speech.

There is only one important war on this earth, and that is the intellectual warfare against that ignorance which is the source

of all other wars. The ignorant cannot be reconstructed by enlightenment until they are fully understood both as a cause and an effect. They cannot be thus adequately understood unless even the most ignorant ones are absolutely free in the expression of their blindest and most passionate complaint. Only thus can we ever know the psychology of ignorance well enough to understand all the contributing factors, and only through such understanding do we acquire a maximum of efficiency in our effort to transform ourselves and the other ignorant ones into self-conscious and socially conscious human beings achieving an automatic, peaceful and equitable adjustment to the realities of life. When both the tyrants and their victims have acquired a complete understanding of each other, slavery and war will cease. Except as it enlarges the understanding of those not concerned, violence directed against exploitation and evil only changes its form. Unlimited intellectual freedom will some day destroy its substance.

LABOR CASTES AND THE UNSKILLED

BY BRUCE ROGERS

A shingle-weaver's wife once told me what "common" cattle loggers are. I did not see the point then and her observation is somewhat obscure to me still. It is possible that the finer distinctions are not clear. I knew, of course, quite well that printers regard them both as rough-necks, but until this visit to the shingle-weaver's home it never occurred to me that social caste lines could afford such difficult obstacles in the way of labor organization.

In spite of the craft ritual, with its profound teachings of fraternalism, and in spite of the solemn vows and obligations taken by the candidate for initiation regarding the common concern and welfare of all labor, inter-craft antipathies are almost as marked as inter-racial ones and much more pernicious. In reality that snobbish caste distinctions among workers cause more intimate friction than the toad-eating fripperies of the rich, whose foolish doings afford this somewhat fatigued world its mead of amusement. However, the difference may in a measure be due to a social lubricant called "etiquette" with which the rich seek to grease their ordinary intercourse.

Not to mention the unskilled, who are in effect expected to "look up" to the superior skilled labor castes and even to the organized of similar grades of labor, the fact is that many highly skilled trades, or "callings" hold themselves aloof from labor organization out of the absurd notion of social superiority. I have

in mind stenographers, bank clerks and office workers, and school teachers. Stenography requires at least four years of high school and six months in college and in employment imposes much responsibility. If organized, the occupation should draw some four times the present average rate of pay. Table-waiting, having no such technical prerequisites, is an organized trade and the waitresses have established themselves in a comparative security and respect such as the ordinary stenographer cannot know. Personally, I have the view that in point of superior intelligence at least the advantage so far developed is on the side of the waitress. Bank clerks discuss the laboring class as if they were apart and yet the ordinary bank clerk does not draw one-half the pay of an electrical worker, and for brains he has a set of levers and nuts over which a cash register is a decided intellectual improvement.

Fraternalism is a sentiment similar to love and affection, but involving a far greater use of the imaginative faculty. Unhappily, imagination is something which workers in hazardous occupations cannot afford to carry in their kits. It would be the end of a structural iron worker or a steeple-jack to dream for a wee moment, and shingle-weavers pay fingers and thumbs for little journeys of fancy. In other callings the imagination of the worker is frequently killed or deadened by the sickly monotony of doing the same thing over and over again. The workers are left with only one cohesive principle so far as I have been able to discover; that of mutual dependence and common interest, a realizing sense of which can be had only by an effective obliteration of the utterly silly and snobbish social caste feeling. Militancy among workers, a much too rare quality, by the way, does invoke an additional cohesive force, that of comradeship of aggressive fighters against a common enemy of whose power to crush and to smash they are sorely conscious.

Organizing unskilled workers adds much to their material status, creates a measure of self-esteem among them. No fair mind can fail to give due credit to the hod carriers and building laborers as a permanent and substantial asset to the labor movement. It follows, therefore, that a reasonably complete organization of the unskilled ought to be accomplished if only the right course may be found, and to do so, in my way of thinking, would be to do away with the chief menace to organized labor in America and to the labor cause in general. Left as they are and with their ever increasing numbers, they can have little or no conception of job rights and ownership, and with no privileges attaching to them except the right to scab whenever the good fortune comes to them.

The California State Federation of Labor has put forth more

serious efforts in this direction than any other division of the American Federation of Labor known to me, but the results so far accomplished, considered with reference to the amount of money and energy expended, are far from encouraging. On the whole, I am convinced that the unskilled must be organized by the unskilled, if at all. The craft-union organizer approaches a "common" laborer and instantly both are conscious of a demarcation between. They are reciprocally unsympathetic. Let the unskilled be afforded every aid and facility they may require. Let organized labor stand by with outstretched hands and beckoning to the end that one good day labor will unite in one indivisible union.

A SOCIALIST DIGEST

A SPLIT AMONG THE GERMAN SOCIALISTS ?

It now seems that the revolt of Karl Liebknecht against his Party was supported in part by fourteen other Socialist members of the Reichstag, according to the reliable *Het Volk*, the Party organ of Holland. Fourteen Socialist members notified the Socialist group that they would absent themselves from the session of December 2, when the second war loan was voted. Moreover, Liebknecht's position, as that of the majority, was supported not only by his own constituency in Potsdam, but also by two-thirds of the Party members of Stuttgart, and by two-fifths of those of Germany's second city, Hamburg—as we shall show below. Moreover, there is reason to believe that he has the support also of the majority of the Socialists of Greater Berlin. The Reichstag Socialist members, however, adopted a resolution in which they said: "The Socialist party strongly condemns Karl Liebknecht's breach of discipline, and it repudiates the misleading information he has spread concerning proceedings within the party." The N. Y. *Call* characterizes this action as the first real symptom of a split in the German Party.

Ledebour has now gone so far as to resign from the Executive Committee of the Party.

The Socialists of Hamburg had recently to nominate a candidate for the Reichstag. Dr. Laufenberg, a young historian, and a strenuous advocate of the Liebknecht policy, received 180 votes against 260 for Stubbe, the official Party and labor union candidate.

The position of the Socialists of Greater Berlin is very clearly

indicated by the struggle for the control of *Vorwaerts* just before the voting of the second war loan on December 2nd.

In this struggle they were lined up against the combined executives of the labor unions and the Socialist Party, but the Greater Berlin Socialists conquered, *Vorwaerts* still remaining in their hands. The control of the official Party organ at this time is a matter of such historical importance that we summarize *Vorwaerts* at some length.

On November 28, *Vorwaerts* published the following complaint against its policy from the General Executive Committee of the Labor Unions:

"*Vorwaerts* is doing nothing to inform the working-class as to the attitude toward the war of the Socialist Parties and unions of foreign countries. It has not replied at all to the numerous attacks of the organs of the Socialist Parties and of the Labor Unions, yes, even of certain foreign Labor organizations against the German Party and the German unions. This has necessarily created the impression that those attacks were recognized by us as being justified. In the interest of the self-respect of the German Labor Movement the central organ in a quiet and business-like way should have repelled these attacks.

"In its reports on the calumnies and treatment of wounded prisoners, *Vorwaerts* has, as a rule, excused the attitude of our neighbors, but has generalized the slips of individuals or newspapers in Germany."

To this *Vorwaerts* published the following reply of the Party Press Committee, which controls the paper:

"After a thorough investigation of the complaints made against the attitude of *Vorwaerts* during the war, the Press Committee declares that the complaints raised against the editing of *Vorwaerts* cannot be recognized as justified. The Press Committee is rather of the opinion that under the present extraordinarily difficult conditions it has fulfilled its duty and task as well as possible. According to Social-Democratic principles and the decisions of International Congresses, *Vorwaerts* has to take the demands of humanity into account, and fight against Chauvinism even in time of war.

"The Press Committee expects from the editors that the attitude of *Vorwaerts* in the future also will be determined by this principle. The Press Committee is convinced that in these conclusions it is in agreement with the overwhelming majority of the patrons of the paper, who have hitherto always demanded a thoroughgoing Social-Democratic attitude. The Executive Committee of the Socialist Electoral Unions of Greater Berlin agrees with this resolution."

Against this declaration on the following day the National Party Executive made the following "rectification":

Vorwaerts publishes in its issue of the 24th of November a declaration which needs to be supplemented. In the declaration the complaints of the General Executive Committee of the Labor Unions are mentioned. In conclusion it is noted that the Press Committee,

after thorough discussion, has agreed with the attitude of *Vorwaerts*.

It is true that the Press Committee made a negative response to the complaints of the General Committee. It passed the resolution mentioned in *Vorwaerts*, but, it must be added that all of *Vorwaerts'* affairs, according to the Party constitution, have to be censored by the Press Committee in collaboration with the Party Executive. The Party Executive did not agree to the resolution of the Press Committee. On the contrary, it expressly rejected it, because it leaves the most important points of complaints fully unconsidered, and because it raises the supposition that some one had demanded that *Vorwaerts* should violate Socialist principles. That has been demanded by nobody; nor has the effort been made from any side, as was expressly proven, to force *Vorwaerts* into a nationalistic course.

But most remarkable of all is the actual split which has already taken place in Wurtemberg, where two-thirds of the Socialists in Stuttgart endorsed the stand taken by Liebknecht as against the official stand of the Party. Being the first definite sign of a possible coming split, this situation is of extreme importance. As in Berlin, the labor unions in Wurtemberg are pro-governmental. We take the first number of our account from an article by J. Koettgen in the *New York Call*:

Party affairs in Wurtemberg are somewhat complicated. The workers in the capital, Stuttgart, and the purely industrial towns of the little kingdom belong to the most advanced (radical) wing of German Social-Democracy. But the country members, largely composed of home-workers, farmers and farm hands, are of the most moderate type of German Social-Democrats. The latter [though a minority] dominate the State Executive [by means of a system of unequal representation] and, through this committee, the policy of the Party. In the past numerous dissensions have arisen by reason of this curious state of things, as the workers of the towns resented the interference of the backward "clodhoppers."

The war has brought things to a head. According to the description given in *La Bataille Syndicaliste* the State Executive had prepared a placard against the war before the beginning of hostilities, in which they stated that big business, hungry for profits, had driven the nation into the world war. The crime of Sarajevo was only a pretext for the Austrian military party which, leaning on Germany, wanted war. German workers would never allow themselves to be killed for the abominable and criminal follies of the Austro-Hungarian government.

But suddenly a state of war was proclaimed in Germany, and the placard could not be put on the walls. What happened then is not clear. But on August 1, Keil, the president of the State Executive, asked the *Schwäbische Tagwacht* to write articles against Russia, and to state that Germany must defend herself against Russia. The editors refused point-blank and, on August 3, Keil himself sent in an article in which he

said: "The perfidy of the Czar has provoked this war, and the hangmen of the Czar must be prevented in making new conquests." The editors did not print the article, and replied that they were not in the habit of changing their opinions every day, that they could not print an article to which they could not reply on account of the existing state of war.

On August 10 the president of the Wurttemberg State Executive demanded that the *Schwaebische Tagwacht* should adapt itself to the sentiments entertained by nine-tenths of the German people. At the same time they condemned a manifesto proposed by the editors as having too much of the class struggle in it. They also vehemently reproached the paper for not having printed all the speeches made by the Emperor and Von Bethman-Hollweg, and for having dared to criticise the parliamentary group.

The editors replied as follows:

"1. It has not yet been proved that nine-tenths of the working class share the viewpoint of the State Executive.

"2. But even if nine-tenths of the people have been swept along with the jingo and imperialist current, it remains the task of Social-Democrats not to allow themselves to be swept along by these follies. On the contrary, they should explain to the people the true causes of this world war. That attitude imposes itself all the more strongly at this moment, when one must, more than ever, remain faithful to one's principles."

The branches of the Wurttemberg party (probably the town branches only) approved of the attitude taken up by the editors, and, on September 19, the Executive tried to impose upon the paper the duty of submitting all branch resolutions to the Executive for censure before publishing them. On September 21 the *Schwaebische Tagwacht* threw out a challenge by publishing on the front page an announcement that Liebknecht was going to speak at a meeting against the annexation of Belgium.

The fat, being now well in the fire, began to burn with great brightness and heat. The Executive denounced the editors, and Crispian, the chief of the editorial trio, replied:

"You will not force us to be jingoes. We shall continue our fight against the tendencies toward annexation. We cannot, and we will not, abandon our principles nor change our convictions under the present circumstances. There are moments in the history of humanity when personal safety must give way to the necessity of sacrificing one's life for humanity."

Koettgen does not give the strongest of Crispian's statements. According to the *Volkszeitung* he said further that—

"the Party has been led into the swamps by workmen in the higher positions of life. He himself was always in the higher position, but nevertheless he held to the struggle. The National Party Executive was incapable of independent politics since it was the prisoner of the General Committee of the Labor Unions. Another one of the radical editors of the *Tagwacht*, Westermeyer, spoke still more strongly. In a Stuttgart meeting he said that 'the party had been betrayed and sold out by the Reichstag Group, which consisted

largely of people who had deceived and swindled the working-class for forty years.' ”

The struggle ended with the dismissal of the editors at the beginning of October by the Executive Committee of the State of Wurttemberg. The Party organizations of Stuttgart and other cities disapproved of this action and supported the editors.

A meeting was held at Stuttgart on the 6th of December, at which Clara Zetkin made an attack on the State Party Executive. Forty-two of the delegates at the meeting then left the room and held a separate meeting, at which they endorsed the stand taken by the Reichstag Group in supporting the war. Of the ninety-two delegates who remained, ninety voted in favor of supporting the editors and endorsed the stand taken by Liebknecht in the Reichstag.

It was after this that the distinct split occurred. The branches in Stuttgart represented by the pro-government minority refused to pay dues to the Stuttgart Party and even attempted to expel Westermeyer. The *Volkszeitung* pointed out that both of these actions are illegal according to the laws of the Party, but it calls this division in the organization merely “a breach of discipline.” The Socialist public of the world will be inclined to call it a split. Will this split spread or is peace to be made between the two factions?—that is the great question. Up to the present the hostility between the two factions has been growing stronger daily ever since the beginning of the war.

REVOLUTION ABROAD AND REACTION AT HOME

The Milwaukee *Leader* has a remarkable editorial, “Revolution Draws Nearer,” in which it sums up the revolutionary tendencies in all the countries of Europe and gives them its full endorsement. The article is so significant both because of the matter it contains and because of the position taken that we reproduce it in full:

Last August there was universal agreement that the “Twilight of the Kings” was at hand. The coming of democracy and the downfall of autocracy was predicted by a whole tribe of prophets.

Then, when the Socialists went to war, when the patriotic craze swept whole peoples into its frenzy and when the “truce of Mars” was proclaimed in every nation in which there was to be no more parties, then these prophets of revolution changed their dream and saw the downfall of all revolutionary movements. Most certain were they that Socialism was gone.

For those who look closely the first real signs of revolution are in sight. It is not simply that in Austria whole cities are reported

to be in the hands of mobs and that there are wide signs of revolt against war in the great German Social-Democracy.

There are even more significant omens in other war-stricken lands. In Belgium, if anywhere on earth, a common misery should have brought a common solidarity. But *L'Humanite*, the French Socialist daily, tells of great protest meetings in Brussels, which "constantly call to mind those gigantic gatherings at the time of the general strike."

These meetings are not held to rally sentiment against the German military government. They are directed against Belgians—against good patriotic Belgians. They are meetings of tenants denouncing the Belgian landlords who, having fled to England, are now urging their agents to collect the pound of flesh from the starving Belgian workers.

There is a hint of the French revolution in this. No class was so hated by the French proletariat as the accursed "emigres" who, from just beyond the frontiers, sought still to continue their economic place upon the backs of the revolutionary workers.

In France the same question has led to the threats of violent upheavals, and has finally compelled the government to grant a three months' moratorium on Paris rents. But it is only a postponement, and when the time comes to collect those accumulated rents from a penniless class of tenants, whose bread winners have been fighting at the front to protect "La Belle France," for "revanche" and several other things, are apt to discover that they have a much more practical if less poetic issue of their own to fight for.

This attitude of the workers in France, as in every other nation, is being aggravated by the insolent treason of the conservatives who have seized every opportunity to violate the "truce of parties" in the interest of clericalism, capitalism and even monarchism.

In Russia, the eager "revolutionists" who rushed "home" to fight for "their country" and the "little father," have been promptly seized by the agents of the "little father" and rushed into penitentiaries, fortress prisons and away to Siberian exile. Not even members of the duma have been exempt from this merciless persecution, and the iron heel of the Czar has been ground deeper than ever into the body of Socialism and liberty in Finland.

In Germany all Socialist meetings in Hamburg have been forbidden, *Vorwaerts* has been gagged, an anti-war daily established in Stuttgart, half a dozen other Social-Democratic organs suppressed, and Saxony is reported to be under special "laws of exception," by which all liberty of expression is stifled.

In England unions and Socialists are attacking the government for its sweating methods, its miserable failure to care for the families at the front, the insults which are mixed with the "charity" extended to those families, and the general revival of all the viciousness of the class struggle.

In short, the rulers of every nation are teaching the workers that there is no war so pitiless as the class war, no enemy so treacherous as the ruling class, no truce that stops the aggressions of greed, and all the other lessons that the first alarm of war seemed to have driven from the minds of the workers.

These are the true signs of a coming revolution. They are the

security that Socialism will not be wiped out by the war. They are the things that spell the downfall of capitalism and class patriotism and militarism and autocracy of every kind—and this not in Europe alone.

In the very same issue, however, in which this revolutionary position is taken as to far-away European politics (the issue of January 30) we find the Milwaukee *Leader* taking the reactionary and nationalistic view on what is perhaps the most important of all domestic questions from the Socialist standpoint: the immigration question. It will be seen that the extracts which follow are not only a breach of the resolution passed by the International Socialist Congress at Stuttgart, but an open defiance of the international movement, and of all internationalism, the very attitude that leads towards war:

The emphasis that the opponents of the immigration measure have placed upon the virtue of ignorance and illiteracy, if correct, would justify the destruction of our educational institutions. If illiteracy is desirable in immigrants it should be quite as desirable in our native born citizens.

Let us face facts and have done with cant.

Ignorance and illiteracy are undesirable wherever found. If the time has come to check immigration, which there is every indication that a majority of the American people believe, a literacy test would have as much merit as any other arbitrary method of checking the human flood from the more backward lands of Europe.

The immigration question has been a football of politics. Three immigration bills have been passed by congress and vetoed, the executive in each instance having based his veto upon the manner in which it has been proposed to exclude aliens rather than upon the wisdom or unwisdom of excluding them.

With the European war threatening to bring a vast army of immigrants to our shores at its conclusion, American workingmen are fearful of the consequences to them. They feel that they are entitled to protection. The American labor market, which is now insufficient to give employment to the workers, may be demoralized by the accessions of millions of additional immigrants.

The fears of the American workingmen may not be warranted, but they exist and, if they should prove real, would justify restrictive measures. The people of the United States are under no obligation to provide homes for Europe's war victims. They are under no greater obligation to provide homes for Europe's and Asia's swarming millions than rests upon the man who has an extra room in his house to turn it over to the first family that moves from the next town to find a more convenient shelter. Their first duty is to themselves.

Being opposed to immigration, the *Leader* demands a stronger militarism and is opposed to disarmament—anti-immigration being a potential cause of war.

THE GERMAN GOVERNMENT SOCIALISTIC ?

We are accustomed to hear certain Socialists point with pride to some of the policies of the German military bureaucracy as being Socialistic. But it is a novelty to hear the German Government itself, or its non-Socialist apologists, making the same claim.

The Government having swallowed the larger part of the Socialists, however, its apologists now claim that it has swallowed Socialism.

"The Committee for Objective Press Reports to Foreign Countries," realizing the widespread popularity of a certain kind of "Socialism," has sent abroad a report in ten languages, from which the following extracts are taken: [We do not undertake to tamper with their English translation.]

We are first told that the German Government is on the road to Socialism, because it has succeeded in putting an end to the class-struggle, which we are assured, is what the Socialists mean by "solidarity":

Whatever one may think of the principle of Socialism, as far as it means "solidarity," it has proved its power and its State-preserving importance in the best manner possible during the present war. The exceptional conditions which prevail in Germany at the present moment—her isolation, the drop in imports and exports, the difficulties in the work market—have by themselves led to protective measures, which necessarily were of a more or less Socialistic character, as now the object was to protect the entire population, at the cost even of individual aims, at the sacrifice of all that would not serve the "general weal," the welfare of all, or, at least, of as many as possible. And that is what we call "solidarity."

Thus the State fosters solidarity between the classes, and in return every individual gives his all to the State. Seldom has State Socialism been more neatly defined.

Yet not all lovers of private property will like this forecast. So the writers explain that these conditions will not be permanent; yet they have no sooner said this than they remember how many persons would like to see them permanent, so the final result is the marriage of "individualism and socialism," with the present German Government officiating:

Such measures are, indeed, only so long of any use, as the exceptional conditions last, which have caused them to be taken, and it cannot be expected that, when normal conditions are restored, they will continue to exist, as then the principle of competition and the positive values of individualism will again return to their usual rights. Many of them, however, might be taken over into the new order of affairs, and just in Germany, where Socialism and individ-

ualism were hitherto always rather sharp opponents, much may be expected from such reconciliation.

The best omen of all the good things that are to come is the "intimate" relation that has been established between the Government and the Social-Democrats:

Furthermore, an importance, which cannot be esteemed highly enough from a civilizatory point of view, must be ascribed to the intimate relations which have been established between the Government and communal authorities and civil organizations on the one hand and the Social-Democratic organizations on the other hand in the numerous problems of the unemployed relief and the war provision.

So much for the German *economic* policy. Similar "socialistic" claims are made with regard to her political system.

In Germany nobody speaks more officially for the Government than do the Professors it employs. One of the best known historians, Lamprecht, now claims that Germany's political system, was even before the war the freest and most democratic in the world, and calls the Social-Democrats as witnesses of the fact:

The gravest and, as Dr. Lamprecht puts it, "perhaps the most widely spread, misconception about us Germans" is that the "German people are the serfs of their princes," as a result of which they are "dependent in thought."

"That false notion," he says, "has probably been dispelled during the initial weeks of the present war." The freedom of public opinion in Germany Dr. Lamprecht declares to have been fully proved by the fact that the German voting system is the freest in the world—"much freer," he adds, "than the French, English, or American system."

"The constitutional life of the German nation," Dr. Lamprecht continues, "is of a thoroughly democratic character. Those who know that were not surprised that our Social-Democrats marched to war with such enthusiasm. Already among their ranks many have fallen as heroes."

"Let it be said once and for all: He who wants to understand us must accept our conception that constitutionally we enjoy so great a political freedom that we would not change with any country in the world. Everybody in America knows that our manners and customs have been democratic for centuries, while in France and England they have been ever aristocratic. Americans, we know, always feel at home on German soil."

"As to our princes, most of us, including the Social-Democrats, are glad in our heart of hearts that we have them. As far back as our history runs, and that is more than 2,000 years, we have had princes. They have never been more than their name 'Fuerst' implies, the first and foremost of German freemen, 'primi inter pares.' Therefore they have never acted independently, never without taking the people into counsel."

THE NATIONAL BASIS OF "KULTUR"

In *The New Statesman* Havelock Ellis discusses "Kultur" as an expert. He is not concerned with the exact meaning of the word, but with the central idea of contemporary Germany. But he is compelled first to show us what the word means:

Thus the series of books, *Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, now in course of publication, edited by Professor Hinneberg and dedicated to the Kaiser, comprises "all departments of science and practice"—religion, history, philosophy, language and literature, the State, society, law, war, mathematics, etc.—while the year-book of the progress of collective "Kultur" issued by Teubners is divided into eighteen sections, the Army and the Fleet coming second after Politics, and Religion and Philosophy last, after Music and the Theatre.

Ellis next proceeds to sketch the evolution of the idea:

"Germanism," as it is sometimes termed in France, began to be shaped as far back as the French Revolution. Dr. René Lote, in his illuminating book, *Du Christianisme au Germanisme*, has lately argued that Germanism, in fact, corresponds to the spirit that in France took another form in the Revolution. The artisans of Germanism were Protestant theologians and philosophers, who, applying their old traditions to the new occasion—the theologians in reaction against the free-thought which threatened their order and the philosophers occupied with moral organization and affirmation—sought to mould and enchain the new movement to their own conception of practical modern German necessities. By such an attitude of reaction, qualified by modified acceptance, the German State might be saved and renewed while yet retaining under its apparent modernity a habit of religious mysticism. The movement was thus a double one: it involved the danger which stimulates and the inspiration which reorganizes. That was why it presented a supreme opportunity to the ambitious will-power of Prussia to erect, on the basis of the traditional German tendency to historical research, an apparatus of beliefs and fictions in the service of its own strenuous State discipline. The eighteenth-century idealism, which in France became embodied in the Revolution, became in Germany the educational violence of a redemptive State and was embodied in "Kultur." Treitschke is the best exponent of this conception.

The very same tendency which made the State supreme over the individual—and this is the significant point for us to note here—made the State equally supreme over even the most intellectual activities of the individual. So it is that in Prussia the school-master and the professor—who in other countries more or less clearly realize that they move in a higher than merely national sphere—became the agents of the State, the willing, even the eager, exponents of the ideals formulated by the State. There we have a clue to the two allied facts that "Kultur" is concerned much more with war and politics than with literature and the arts, and that it

is profoundly national, so that there may be a contest among "Kulturs," and the best is entitled, even by force—for its force is regarded as essentially a part of its goodness—to dominate the others.

Prussia shaped the meaning and actuality of "Kultur" from the beginning. But Prussia did not rule Germany and was not in a position to coerce Germans into her mould until after 1870. And within a few years a great voice arose—a German voice that revealed its true character and forecast its downfall:

All the main lines of the Prussian system were well and firmly developed before the war of 1870, and ensured the triumphant issue of that war over a less well organized adversary. Then it was that Germanism suddenly flowered out into what was unmistakably "Kultur." Except it may be implicitly, we scarcely find "Kultur" in any of the great German writers of the earlier nineteenth century. Even Heine, who was so acutely sensitive a critic of his Germany, never detected it. But almost immediately after the war (1873), in the essay on D. F. Strauss, Nietzsche analyzed German "Kultur" with penetrating insight. He revealed all the elements of narrow provincialism which it held, the latent—when not blatant—vulgarity of its ideals, and its remoteness from all true culture. German scholars, he said, worked in the spirit of agricultural laborers, and German science, so far from making for culture, was possibly making for barbarism. It was a forecast which seemed extravagant at the time, but now we may be tempted to regard it as the intuition of genius.

THE RAPID DEVELOPMENT OF NATIONALIST SOCIALISM

Not only in Germany and the United States, but also in Great Britain, Belgium, and everywhere the same tendency is in evidence. We see it in the last two countries in the following comment by *The New Statesman* of a speech made by Vandervelde in London:

Perhaps the most striking feature of M. Vandervelde's speech was its revelation of the turning-point which has been reached in the International Socialist movement. Throughout "the International" of the past half century there ran always a strain of opposition to "nationalism," even in its purest form of patriotic loyalty, as to a creed outworn. The world-wide union of the proletariat was actually to supersede, and even to obliterate, the lines of national organization, with its paraphernalia of monarchs, flags, and historical sentiments. To-day, as M. Vandervelde described, the Socialist Trade Unionists and Co-operators are standing side by side with the bankers and merchants of Belgium, under the leadership of their King, in defense of something that they all deem of greater importance even than the "class struggle." In France, in Germany and Austria, in Great Britain and in Italy

the same new grouping was to a greater or less extent making itself apparent, not in suppression of Socialism, but as a symptom of working-class feeling which Socialism would have to take more into account. Internationalism in the future would no longer deny or ignore or depreciate either the strength or the value of national patriotism and loyalty to one's country—least of all among the proletarians in the several nations of Europe.

AGAINST EXCESSIVE PARTY DISCIPLINE

Most extraordinary has been the approval of Liebknecht by the Socialist press of the neutral countries. Nobody has dreamed of criticising Liebknecht and nearly all Socialist organs express passionate admiration—especially the German Socialist papers of this country. One of the oldest and most valuable of these, the San Francisco *Vorwaerts*, says:

We Socialists knew, and know, that aside from revolution there is no war that can be waged in the interest of the working-class. . . .

Instead of leaving the responsibility of the war on those who alone should carry it, Social-Democrats suddenly and voluntarily offered their shoulders to carry this burden of the governing-class. Yes, we openly say it, this blood-guilt. . . .

A large part of the Reichstag Socialists were against the granting of the first loan. Only a decision of the whole group restrained them. Doubtless that was true this time also. But that Karl Liebknecht had the courage to vote against the Group gives him a double value. . . .

These tributes are all the more remarkable in view of the notorious fact that German Socialists hold party discipline in such high regard.

The New York *Volkszeitung* takes Liebknecht's position as being so solid that it builds upon it an attack against the greatest fetish of all, party discipline itself.

German Socialists actually suffer from the hereditary evil of discipline. In school, in the barracks and in the Party, we always heard nothing but "iron discipline" praised and prized as the highest virtue. And this keeping step went so thoroughly into our flesh and blood, became to such a degree a custom taken for granted, that the overwhelming majority of us, even in America, are more or less exasperated by the continuously changing pace of all non-Germans. . . .

No one will deny that discipline, like every other "cause," has two sides; yes, that the German Socialist movement expressed its specific character through its unity—which helped it over many deep waters and morasses. That Germany has never known an Anarchistic movement of any importance, that the syndicalistic "localized" labor union tendency was always a negligible factor

and always will be, that a split in the German Social Democracy has hitherto been avoided, was, and still is due to the uniformity of action which regards every departure from the ranks as a breach of discipline, a betrayal of the Cause. . . .

But the unity of the German Socialists was also the necessary condition of the unfolding of its power. If it wishes to be in the position to be able to throw its word into the scales, if it wanted to have a decisive voice, then all differences of opinion had necessarily to be covered up and suppressed.

That much discipline has accomplished and therefore it has done great service.

That was one side. The other lies in the regrettable but unfortunately general fact that every spiritual movement loses its inner content as soon as it becomes the common property of a great mass. That is, the Socialist movement must lose in revolutionary momentum, if it attracts the larger part of the population to it in relatively short time, without having had the opportunity of sufficiently educating the newly converted adherents. As was the case in Germany, for example, with the hundreds of thousands of labor unionists brought into the Party, who for the most part had only a very vague idea of Socialism. The first result was, of course, that the rank and file became more and more opportunistic, which fact then necessarily showed itself in the composition of the Socialist groups in the Reichstag, and state governments. It was, therefore, only a question of time until the maintenance of strict discipline, the carrying out of Party unity in the Reichstag, would necessarily lead to such actions as that in Berlin on August 4th. . . .

Under such conditions, the questions of discipline, or rather the question as to how far every Socialist Party must subject itself to discipline, how far the will of the majority becomes a law for the minority, becomes just as important for the United States as for Germany or France. . . .

The *International Socialist Review* also attacks the discipline-fetish:

The Germans, as Julius Caesar knew them, cared a great deal more for liberty than for discipline. This attitude they maintained steadfastly for hundreds of years, during which they developed magnificent qualities in nearly every field of endeavor except war, where they suffered century after century at the hands of nations more disciplined than themselves. Finally Prussia, an almost absolute military monarchy, conquered one little German state after another, and finally through the Austrian war of 1866 and the French war of 1871 made its king the kaiser of the German Empire. Since then discipline has been the watchword of the Germans. To it they have sacrificed nearly all the individual freedom they ever had. On the surface, the results obtained seem dazzling to many minds. The average man is thereby relieved of the need of thinking; he obeys his superior unquestioningly, and the superior is held responsible for results by some man higher up. At the top of the pyramid stands the kaiser, "und Gott." It is the

absolutism of the dark ages carried over into the twentieth century. It has produced a war machine almost but we trust not quite strong enough to conquer the world. But in so doing it has made the army officer supreme over the enlisted man and the wage-worker alike. It is a terrible degeneracy, a reversion to the dominant type of the year 1000.

Even those who call themselves revolutionists are infected by the discipline germ, both in Germany and among those Socialists of other countries who are fascinated by the seeming successes of the German movement. It is easy to follow "leaders"; it is pleasant to be a "leader." At first leaders and followers alike think they are pressing forward toward the Social Revolution. But presently the Party Machine, growing from day to day, becomes to the leaders an end in itself instead of a step toward the revolution. Anxiety for the immediate future of the Socialist Machine hushed the voices of the Socialists in the Reichstag when the issue was peace or war. Discipline held the rest of the German Socialists in line. That is why our enemies are laughing and we—are explaining.

DECREASE IN THE SOCIALIST PARTY VOTE

Estimates of the Socialist Party vote at the last Fall election vary considerably. The *International Socialist Review* estimates the total 1914 vote at 601,000, as compared with 901,000 in 1912. The New York *Volkszeitung's* estimate is 687,000. As we are concerned with the loss in the vote and do not wish to exaggerate, we shall accept the *Volkszeitung's* estimate.

The difference between the figures is due largely to the fact that in some instances the highest vote obtained has been used, and in others the average straight Party vote. For example, in New York, according to one estimate, the Socialist vote was 55,000; according to another it was 38,000. This indicates that some 17,000 Socialist voters, or nearly one-third of the total, failed to cast their votes for the whole Socialist ticket—and therefore were not very good Socialists. But nevertheless we shall take the *Volkszeitung's* figures.

Let us first make a comparison with the election of two years ago, that of 1912. The loss in the total vote, or the average loss in the states, was 23%. Undoubtedly the total vote cast by all parties was, as usual, considerably less in the congressional as compared with the presidential election, but it was scarcely so much as 23%, so in most states there was a loss relative to other parties as well as an absolute loss.

Let us now examine briefly the situation by states. Some few states (mostly small ones) showed a very brilliant increase. This was especially true of some of the Rocky Mountain states, and of some of the agricultural states of the Southwest. In three of the mining states the increase was from fourteen to sixty-three per cent.; in three of the latter from twenty to twenty-nine per cent. That is, there was a rapid increase in six of the forty-eight states.

Oregon also showed a slight increase, while the vote in Kansas, Texas, and North Dakota remained approximately stationary. In these ten Western states, then, the situation is either excellent or at least satisfactory. In two Eastern states only have the Socialists held their own, New York and New Jersey, though in both there was a slight absolute loss.

Against these twelve states there are eighteen important states which have shown either a slow or a rapid decline. The states of the smallest vote, like those of the South, may be left entirely out of the question. The percentage of the Socialist vote lost since 1912 in the states of slow but decided decline was as follows:

Maryland	19%
Wisconsin	22%
Massachusetts	25%
Washington	25%
California	(approximately) 28%

The states where the decline was rapid were as follows:

Minnesota	31%
Indiana	40%
Connecticut	40%
Ohio	41%
Missouri	41%
Utah	42%
S. Dakota	42%
Nebraska	44%
Iowa	50%
Illinois	51%
Michigan	55%
Pennsylvania	55%
Kentucky	57%

Certainly such loss as this cannot be said to be explained away from any point of view. Of course the well-informed Socialist will draw a lesson from the varying Socialist losses in a number of these states. Especially noteworthy is the tremendous loss in Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Minnesota, and Connecticut; and scarcely less important are the very considerable losses in California and Wisconsin.

Let us now make a brief comparison of the Congressional election of 1914 with the Congressional election of 1910. This comparison shows that during the four years, during which the voting population of the country increased considerably, the Socialist vote almost stood still—there having been an increase of only 80,000, confined to a few states. Twenty-seven thousand of this increase was in Oklahoma and thirteen thousand in Texas—thus accounting for half the total. Part of the rest was also due to the extension of Woman Suffrage to certain states.

This comparison also shows some remarkable losses in the Socialist vote—that of the Wisconsin party, for example, fell in these four years from 40,000 to less than 27,000, that of Pennsylvania from 60,000 to 40,000. These were states, it will be remembered, which in 1910 elected a considerable number of Socialist office holders. The vote in Ohio also fell from 62,000 in 1910 to 51,000 in

1914. It will be remembered that during this period the Party organization in Ohio has fallen into new hands.

Indeed, it is worth while to compare the vote to that of periods further back than in 1910. So it is found, for example, that vote in Illinois this year is less than it was in 1906. That of Wisconsin this year is less than it was in 1906 or in 1904, i. e., ten years ago. The present vote in Massachusetts is less than one-third of what it was in 1902, and slightly less than the figure of 1900.

In closing, it should be pointed out that the states upon which the Socialists of the country centered their greatest efforts and from which they hoped for the chief results were West Virginia, Michigan and Colorado, the states of labor union persecutions. Yet the vote fell since the 1912 election in all three of these states, worst of all in Michigan, where it decreased from 23,000 to 11,000—a result partly to be accounted for, no doubt, by the split in the Finnish organization.

GUESDE URGES ITALY TO WAR ON DEMOCRATIC GROUNDS

The Italian revolutionary Socialist, D'Ambris, records the following interview with Jules Guesde:

Guesde said that he had no intention of prescribing modes of action to the Italian Party. But he complained of the fact that they believed that they would be untrue to Socialist teachings and principles if they recognized facts which were evident to everybody. They lived in the illusion that they were fulfilling their duty if they denied the test of reality. Guesde then gave the following reasons why it was the duty of the Italian Socialist Party to participate in the war.

In the first place, the war would be shortened through the intervention of Italy, which would mean an immense saving of human life. If the Italian Socialists called themselves opponents of war, they must do their best by taking part in the war to bring the butchery to a close. If they do not do that then they are not following any principle whatever, but solely regard for their own convenience.

In the second place, Guesde regards the intervention of Italy necessary so that in case of a victory of the Allied powers, which he considers certain, Italy would strengthen the influence of the democratic countries, England, France and Belgium, and serve as a counter-weight to the influence of Russia. At the same time, Guesde contends that Russia cannot be regarded as an exclusively reactionary power. Russian politics, because of the war, will automatically become accessible to modern influences. A victory of the

Allied powers would free Russia from the economic servitude in which Germany has placed it; in this war the road to bourgeois development would be open, and the bourgeoisie would enforce liberal forms of government, as everywhere. A counter-weight against Russia is necessary most of all in the nationality question, since it must be demanded of the Russians that they recognize the rights of Poland and Roumania. When D'Ambris interrupted that, according to the views of the Italian Socialists, the nationality question is of no moment, or at least does not concern the Socialists, Guesde replied that this was an absurdity. Before a solution of national problems we cannot possibly reach the foundations for the International.

Finally, D'Ambris spoke of the amazement of the Italian Socialists that Guesde had taken part in the Ministry, in spite of his Marxist and revolutionary convictions. To this Guesde declared that one should not conceive radicalism as being the same thing as petrification. To-day, when it is a question of defending the country, Guesde offered his co-operation with the government in the deepest conviction. Certainly the class struggle continues even during the war, but to-day the government is more a country of national defense than a means for the protection of employers.

ROSENFELD'S POEMS *

BY ANNA STRUNSKY WALLING

As long as there are toilers and parasites, and as long as the aspiration for freedom dwells in the human breast, the poems of Morris Rosenfeld will live, and inspire all those who read them. For as long as there is suffering, and oppression what else can there be to write about?

These are not themes that he has chosen out of a variety of subjects; they have chosen him. They are his life, and the significance and the force of them lie in the fact that they are also the life of that nation of people into which all the nations of the world are merged—the life of the workers whose body and soul belong to the Machine. They are the songs of the slaves of the Machine. Their sorrows, their mute appeals, their suffering, their protest, their awakening is expressed in them as nowhere else, for their creator, too, has been a slave of the Machine. He and his have suffered toil, and hunger and disease. Again and again his babes have withered and died because of the poverty of their tailor-poet father. Again and again he has suffered the death of his spirit children, because his days belonged to the "Boss" and his nights to utter weariness. Throughout this night which lay over many years of his life a nightingale sang and made it resound with unearthly beauty.

Once before we have had a glimpse in English of Morris Rosenfeld's work—through the translation of Prof. Wiener of Harvard. For many years now his poetry has been known internationally. The present volume, "Songs of Labor," a selection of Morris Rosenfeld's most poignant, most impassioned, and most

* SONGS OF LABOR and Other Poems by Morris Rosenfeld. Translated from the Yiddish by Rose Pastor Stokes and Helena Frank. (Boston: Richard G. Badger.)

characteristic poems, is the first metrical translation in English of his writings. They are the work of Comrade Rose Pastor Stokes, in collaboration with Helena Frank of England. It is in itself a poetical and significant coincidence that Mrs. Stokes, who in her life as well as in her work so wholly incarnates the struggle, the martyrdom, and the hope of labor, should be the translator of these poems. She knew her Rosenfeld by heart when she worked in the shop, and even then, in her early girlhood, she was attempting the present translation. It has been a labor of love in the fullest sense of the word, beginning in one era of her life, and continuing into another—a love that has grown with the years. She has attempted the impossible, for the music and the lyrical power of Rosenfeld's poems are inseparably bound up with the spirit of the Jewish language, in the forming and the vitalizing of which they have played so great a role. If the translators of these poems have caught something of the poignant charm of the music of these poems, something of their simplicity and passion, something of their cadence, their dramatic force, and have been able to suggest their universal appeal, then they have indeed succeeded in as poetically ambitious a task as they could have set before themselves.

They have caught the spirit of Rosenfeld, and to have been able to do so is to have passed beyond translation. These poems have sung themselves into the blood of the translators and they were able to re-create them for those to whom the original is closed.

One feels that the poet himself would congratulate them on the selection they have made. For the forty poems thus rendered into English, not one but is characteristic of Rosenfeld's genius. "My Boy" is the story of the child who never sees its workingman-father. No poem known to the writer anywhere so throbs with the paternal passion. In "Despair" is expressed the yearning of the toiler for a breathing spell, for a sight of the flowers and trees, for the woods, the birds; it sounds the depths of that despair which comes from his realization that none of these are for him, that he is immured for life in the shop, and that only death can free him. The "Candle-Seller," the story of a woman-pedler who dies over her basket, breathes at once the pity and the menace of an outraged heart. In "Liberty" the poet is confronted by a vision of freedom who calls upon him to "set freedom free."

In all of these poems one feels not alone his intense sympathy and his unflinching realism, but, what is rarer, one feels the cosmic consciousness, the resounding echoes of a social movement.

Rosenfeld is a convinced Socialist; but although to the poet Socialism is a creed, a hope, a transcendent flash of the spirit, potent to inspire, the breath of his life, what he feels and must write about is not the sunrise that he has not yet seen, but the long and bitter night which he has to endure.

"The man in me sleeping begins to awaken;
The thing that was slave into slumber has passed:
Now; up with the man in me! Up and be doing!
No misery more! Here is freedom at last!
When sudden: a whistle!—the Boss—an alarum!—
I sink in the slime of the stagnant routine;—
There's tumult, they struggle, oh lost is my ego;—
I know not, I care not, I am a machine! . . .

EDITORS' NOTE

In our April issue will appear a very important article by Dr. William J. Robinson, on "The Prevention of Conception." This will be followed by an article on "Sex and the Elders," by Elsie Clews Parsons, an authority in her particular subject.

We are now preparing to start a new department, "The Best of the Current Books." We believe this will prove a very valuable feature of the NEW REVIEW. Watch the April issue.

NEW REVIEW

BOARD OF EDITORS

Frank Bohn
 William E. Bohn
 Floyd Dell
 W. E. B. Du Bois
 Max Eastman
 Louis C. Fraina
 Felix Grendon
 Isaac A. Hourwich
 Paul Kennaday
 Robert Rives La Monte
 Arthur Livingston
 Robert H. Lowie
 Helen Marot
 Herman Simpson
 Wm. English Walling

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Arthur Bullard
 George Allan England
 Charlotte Perkins Gilman
 Arturo Giovanitti
 Reginald Wright Kaufmann
 Harry W. Laidler
 Austin Lewis
 John Macy
 Gustavus Myers
 Mary White Ovington
 William J. Robinson
 Charles P. Steinmetz
 J. G. Phelps Stokes
 Horace Traubel
 John Kenneth Turner
 Albert Sonnichsen

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Alexander Fraser
 Jessie Ashley
 Louise W. Kneeland
 Gertrude U. Light
 Arthur Livingston
 Max Heidelberg
 Wm. English Walling
 Louis C. Fraina

CONTENTS FOR MARCH, 1915

	PAGE
Where and Whither?.....	120
<i>Robert Rives La Monte.</i>	
China Before and After the War.....	126
<i>J. A. Jackson.</i>	
The Menace of An American Militarism..	132
<i>Louis C. Fraina.</i>	
The Repressed South.....	141
<i>Joseph C. Manning.</i>	
REORGANIZATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL:	
A Complete Reorganization.....	147
<i>Edward S. Smith.</i>	
A Symphony of Nations.....	148
<i>H. W. Freeman.</i>	
Opposes An International Policy.....	148
<i>Charles P. Steinmetz.</i>	
Basically Economic International	149
<i>Justus Ebert.</i>	
Socialism Not Against Nationalism.....	149
<i>A. A. Heller.</i>	
A Travesty	150
<i>Moses Oppenheimer.</i>	
Reorganize the American Movement.....	151
<i>Jeannette D. Pearl.</i>	
The International Lives.....	152
<i>A. S. Headingley.</i>	
No Pseudo-Socialist International!.....	153
<i>Dr. Leo Caplan.</i>	
What Is Socialism?	154
<i>H. A. Goff.</i>	
An Old International Congress.....	155
<i>Geo. N. Falconer.</i>	
Calls for a Referendum.....	156
<i>Charles M. Thompson.</i>	
Free Speech and the War.....	157
<i>Theodore Schroeder.</i>	
Labor Castes and the Unskilled.....	160
<i>Bruce Rogers.</i>	
A SOCIALIST DIGEST:	
A Split Among the German Socialists?.....	162
Revolution Abroad and Reaction at Home....	166
The German Government Socialistic?.....	169
The National Basis of "Kultur".....	171
Rapid Development of Nationalist Socialism..	172
Against Excessive Party Discipline.....	173
Decrease in Socialist Party Vote.....	175
Guesde Urges Italy to War.....	177
Rosenfeld's Poems	178
<i>Anna Strunsky Walling.</i>	

Published Monthly by the New Review Publishing Association

87 GREENWICH AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY

ALEXANDER FRASER

President

MAX HEIDELBERG

Treasurer

LOUIS C. FRAINA

Secretary

Subscription \$1.00 a year in United States and Mexico; six months, \$0.50. \$1.20 in Canada and \$1.50 in foreign countries. Single copies, 10 cents. In bundles of 5 or more, 6 cents a copy.

Entered at the New York post-office as second-class mail matter.

A HISTORY OF THE GREAT WAR

Do you want a history of the Great War in its larger social and revolutionary aspects? Interpreted by the foremost Socialist thinkers? The following FIVE issues of the NEW REVIEW constitute the most brilliant history extant:

FEBRUARY, 1915, ISSUE

"A New International," by Anton Pannekoek; "Light and Shade of the Great War," by H. M. Hyndman; "Against the 'Armed Nation' or 'Citizen Army,'" by F. M. Wibaut, of Holland; "The Remedy for War: Anti-Nationalism," by William English Walling; "A Defense of the German Socialists," by Thomas C. Hall, D.D.; the SOCIALIST DIGEST contains: Kautsky's "Defense of the International;" "A Criticism of Kautsky;" A. M. Simons' attack on the proposed Socialist party peace program; "Bourgeois Pacifism;" "A Split Coming in Switzerland?" "Proposed Peace Program of the American Socialist Party;" "Messages from Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg," etc.

JANUARY, 1915, ISSUE

"A Call for a New International;" "Capitalism, Foreign Markets and War," by Isaac A. Hourwich; "The Future of Socialism," by Louis C. Fraina; "As to Making Peace," by Charles Edward Russell; "The Inner Situation in Russia," by Paul Axelrod; "Theory, Reality and the War," by Wm. C. Owen; the SOCIALIST DIGEST contains: "Kautsky's New Doctrine," "Marx and Engels Not Pacifists," by Eduard Bernstein; "An American Socialist Party Resolution Against Militarism;" "The International Socialist Peace Congress;" "A Disciplining of Liebknecht?" "German Socialists and the War Loans;" "Militarism and State Socialism," etc.

DECEMBER, 1914, ISSUE

"Did Capitalism Want the War?" by John Moody, expert economist; "The War and Dogma," by Mary White Ovington; "The New Map of Europe," by William English Walling; "Russia the Real Menace," by Charles P. Steinmetz; the SOCIALIST DIGEST Contains: "Shall the International Be Reorganized?" "German Socialists Who Are Against the War;" "Russian Revolutionary Opinion;" "Armament and Capitalism," etc.

NOVEMBER, 1914, ISSUE

"Downfall of the International," by Anton Pannekoek; "Freedom of Will and the War," by Prof. Jacques Loeb; "The War: Personal Impressions," by Robert Rives La Monte; SOCIALIST DIGEST contains: French, British and Belgian Manifestoes; "Imperialism and Social Democracy;" "The German Socialists;" "Position of the Italian Socialists;" "Swiss Socialists Against German Socialists," etc.

OCTOBER, 1914, ISSUE

"Socialism and the War," by Isaac A. Hourwich; "German Socialists and the War," by William English Walling; "War-Time Reflections," by Floyd Dell; "Attitude of Italy," by Prof. Arthur Livingston; "French Socialists and the War;" "Italian Socialists and the War;" "American Socialists and the War," etc.

SPECIAL OFFER

These five invaluable issues—total price, 50 cents—can be secured for 35 cents, postpaid; or better still, send us \$1.15 for a year's subscription, starting with the March issue, and get these five splendid issues FREE! Act now!

NEW REVIEW 87 Greenwich Avenue
New York City